

4257. bbb. 3.
The Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin, stated
and defended.

IN
A SUMMER-MORNING'S
Conversation, between a Minister and a
Neighbour.

CONTAINING
REMARKS on a late anonymous Pamphlet,
Intituled, "A WINTER-EVENING'S Con-
versation, upon the Doctrine of Original
Sin, between a Minister and three of his
Neighbours, accidentally met," &c.

WITH
AN APPENDIX, in Reply to a SUPPLEMENT
in the *New-Haven* Edition of that Pamphlet.

By PETER CLARK, A. M. *

Pastor of the first Church in Danvers.

Recommended in a P R E F A C E by several Ministers.

JOB 32. 5. *When Elihu saw that there was no Answer in the
Mouth of these three Men, then his Wrath was kindled.*

PECCATUM ORIGINALE, seu nobiscum natum, toti Mundo
absconditum est; nec revelatur Viribus, Rationibus, aut
Speculationibus nostris, sed potius obscuratur, defenditur, et
excusatur. Ideo Opus est Verbo Dei de Cœlo, quo revelatur
hæc naturæ Immundities, seu Vitium. LUTH. LOC. COM.

B O S T O N : Printed and Sold by S. KNEELAND, oppo-
site to the Probate Office in Queen-street, 1758.

Printed by J. H. B. Co., New York.

MI

A SUMMER-MORNING

Cooperation between a Minister and a

Model 1

It is not a very common name.

Printed by the Government Printer, Ottawa.




1941

RECAPITULATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COURT OF COMMONS, IN THE YEAR 1790.

Account - A record of the business transactions of a company.

1942

100-365411-1



A Recommendatory PREFACE.

WHEREAS a *Pamphlet* lately published, and industriously spread among us, Intituled, "*A Winter-Evening's Conversation*, upon the Doctrine of *Original Sin*," is of pernicious Tendency, and calculated (it seems) with a View to profelyte ignorant and unwary People, chiefly by influencing their Passions,—making tragical Exclamations against the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, commonly received in the Churches of the Reformation, as if it imply'd, that Children dying in *Infancy* suffer the *eternal Torments of Hell* for the first Sin of *Adam*;—when it is well known, the Patrons of that Doctrine are wont to leave the future State of *such* among the *secret Things* which belong to GOD alone:—We are deeply concerned to find the Scripture-Doctrine, in such an important Article, so misrepresented, yea, deny'd and derided, as it is in the said *Pamphlet*; but we rejoyce to see the very dangerous Errors, therein contained, judiciously and solidly confuted, by our worthy & dear Brother, in the following excellent *Tract*; which we accordingly recommend to the diligent and prayerful Perusal of God's People: earnestly beseeching our glorious Lord to pour out his Spirit, to convince Men of Sin, and lead them to Christ, by whom only any of the Posterity of *Adam* can be saved.

And on this Occasion we would solemnly advise and intreat the Churches, whenever vacant, to beware of settling any Man in the Pastoral Office, who does not profess a firm Belief of the great Doctrine here defended, and the other important Articles of our holy Religion, dependent on it, or connected with it.

P R E F A C E.

We apprehend, the prevailing of *corrupt Principles* (as well as of corrupt Practices) not duly testify'd against, is a Ground of God's awful Controversy with his People at this Day, and a Reason why he in his Providence is threatening to unchurch & disinherit us. Surely 'tis high Time therefore, not only for the Friends of Zion to *weep in secret*, but to appear openly in the Cause of Truth, and on the Lord's Side; and *stand fast in one Spirit, with one Mind, striving together for the Faith of the Gospel.*

Our Hearts Desire and Prayer to God for his People and their Offspring, is, that they may be *nourished up in the Words of Faith, and of good Doctrine*; that *the Faith once delivered to the Saints*, may be preserved pure and entire in the Churches of Christ:— and that *the Word of the Lord may have free Course, and be glorified among us*, thro' all successive Generations.

And we beseech you, Brethren, that you strive together with your Ministers in Prayer to God for us, that we may always come unto you in the Fulness of the Blessing of the Gospel of Christ. Amen.

BOSTON, March

7. 1758.

Joseph Sewall,
Thomas Prince,
Samuel Phillips,
Thomas Foxcroft,
E. Pemberton.





A

Summer-Morning's Conversation,

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN,

Between a Minister, and a Neighbour.



The NEIGHBOUR to the Minister.

SIR, I am very glad to find you at Home ; for I am come this Morning with a Desire to have some Conversation with you, on a very important Subject.

MINISTER. Sir, I am glad to see you, and am ready at your Service ; be pleas'd therefore to let me know your Business.

NEI. It is this--- I happen'd to be in Company, one Evening last Winter, with two of my Neighbours, where was a certain *Minister* (whose Name I forbear to mention) who had a long Conference with us concerning the Doctrine of *Original Sin* : The Substance of which Conference he has since published, under the Title of *A Winter Evening's Conversation between a Minister, and Three of his Neighbours*, upon that Subject. I was, for Distinction-sake, called the *first Neighbour*, and am represented as more strenuous in opposing said Minister, than either of the other two. But then, in the Close, I am spoken of as being determin'd to take the Matter into more serious Consideration.--- Accordingly, I have so done : And now, altho' I am suspicious, that I have carried the Matter with Respect to Infants too far, in Saying (as I am represented, Pag. 6.)

B

" I

"I doubt not but many of them are weltring in the Lake of Fire, in Consequence of the first Sin of *Adam*;" Yet as to the Doctrine it self, viz. that of *Original Sin*, which the said Minister vehemently decries, I cannot, at present, perswade my self, but that it is a sound Doctrine. And yet I am very desirous, that you would so far gratify me, as to remove some Difficulties, which the said Gentleman has thrown in my Way.

MIN. I have indeed heard, some time ago, of a Pamphlet spread among us, with the Title you mention; and have occasionally, of late, had a Sight of it: And am sorry to find by your Account, Friend, that it was in Reality the Composure of a *Minister* of the Gospel among us. I had otherwise tho't it to have been a Fiction of the Brain of some strange Romanick Writer, who design'd by it to vent his Spleen at the Scripture-Doctrine of Man's Original Corruption; and to put the better Colour on it, had cast it into the Form of a *Dialogue*, between a Minister and some of his Neighbours. For it must be confess'd, This is a Doctrine most disagreeable to the proud Heart of Man, as it tends to beat down that *Pharisaical* Conceit he is apt to entertain of the Goodness of his Nature; that it is no Wonder at all, if what is said against it, in a popular plausible Strain, should be so palatable to many, especially to such as are in a great Measure Strangers to Heart-work in Religion, and to some whom I had a better Opinion of, as I hear that Pamphlet is. But as it is a Doctrine evidently held forth in Scripture, receiv'd by the Catholick Church in all Ages, agreed to in all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, confirm'd by sad Observation and Experience, felt and lamented as the heaviest Burden by the most enlightned pious Souls, who may reasonably be suppos'd to have studied themselves best; so to dispute against it, is to dispute against Fact, and Experience, as well as the plain Dictates of sacred Writ. Infomuch that, as a learned and pious Divine observes, "To us, Men's denying this Doctrine is one Argument to prove it; were not Men blind and dead in Sin, they could not but be sensible of it. But Men swimming with the Waters, are not sensible of the Strength of the Stream."

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 3

“Stream.” It is therefore to be lamented, that there should be any one of the sacred Order so little acquainted with the *Plague of his own Heart*, as to make light of this sad Effect of Man’s Apostacy; yea, to reject the Notion with Contempt, and finally, to represent it as a dangerous and hurtful Doctrine. How unfit is such a Teacher to prepare Souls for Christ, who flatters his Hearers into a Conceit, that their Natures are whole and sound, and uncorrupt? Does not this plainly tend to abate, if not wholly suppress, a Sense of their Need of the great Physician of Souls, and his supernatural Grace, by which alone they can be recovered out of their lapsed State? Who seems to exclude such from his Commission, as are not deeply sensible of their spiritual Maladies, saying (Mar. 2. 17.) *The whole have no Need of the Physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the Righteous, but Sinners to Repentance.*---Indulge me thus far, in expressing my Concern, that this *Pelagian Error* should be revived among us, which is of so perilous Consequence to Men’s Souls.--- Now go on.

NEI. That I may be as little tedious to you as possible, I shall wave all that was Ceremonious, or Preliminary to our Debate. And, first of all, I would now know your Opinion, *Sir*, Whether this Doctrine of Original Sin be one of the fundamental Doctrines of Religion? This the said Minister implicitly denied, saying (p. 4.) “It is a very little Thing, compared with the great Fundamentals of Religion,” which he had been just mentioning.

MIN. The Doctrine of the universal Apostacy of Mankind, I am sure, is fundamental to the Doctrine of Redemption by Christ. So it is laid down by the Apostle, *Rom. 5. 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, &c.* And Original Sin is plainly included in, and necessarily inferred from this universal Apostacy. For that which affects not only some few *Individuals*, but the whole *Species*, must originate in some common Cause or Principle, that extends it’s Influence to the whole Kind; and what can that be, but the Sin and Fall of our first Parents from a State of Innocence? Search the Records of Antiquity, and if you can find any other Act, or Event, since the beginning of the World, to which

4 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

this so great and general Apostacy of Mankind can with greater, or even equal Reason or Probability, be assigned, as the Cause or Occasion, we shall no longer impute it to the Sin of *Adam* only. But till this be done, the Scripture-Account must stand good, That by one Man Sin enter'd into the World: And by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners. Rom. 5. 12, 19. I therefore freely acknowledge, I look upon this, as not only a Doctrine of Scripture, but a fundamental One. Nor do I understand how the Christian Scheme can be consistent with itself, or supported with Honour, without this Basis. And this is agreeable to the History of *Moses* in Gen. 3d. where Man's Apostacy is supposed as the Foundation of that gracious Promise of a Redeemer, under the Character of the Seed of the Woman, ver. 15. which was the Dawning of the Gospel-Day. But perhaps, your saying, "you could have but little Charity for them that deny it," may need some Correction: I mean, such as deny, or doubt of it, in the Point of Imputation, provided they own the Depravation of Man's Nature, and are sensible of their own Corruption, and see their Need of the Grace of God in a Redeemer, and appear to be Persons of serious Piety; these are not to be excluded our Charity, tho' they are not as yet entirely satisfied in the Doctrine of the Imputation of the first Sin, by Reason of the Intricacies that Men's Disputes have involv'd it in; which otherwise has a clear and solid Foundation in Scripture: and therefore I would be far from advising you to choose such a Man for your Teacher, who is not full in his Belief and Profession of this important Doctrine.

NEI. I am willing to receive your Instruction, and own I may have transgressed the Rules of Charity in that unguarded Expression. But the Minister, in pleading for Charity towards those who deny this Doctrine, seems to be of the Mind, that they have much more Reason, upon their Principles, to break Charity with those who teach it.

THE MIN. Charity, we know, is a fundamental Grace; and we are oblig'd, in some Sense, to extend and exercise it towards all Men, especially our Christian Brethren. But if Charity be taken for our good Opinion or Esteem of a Person,

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 5

son, as a Brother in Christ, with a kind Affection to him as such ; so it is limited, by the Rule of the Gospel, to those who are of the same Faith and Christian Fellowship with our selves. And as to others who embrace dangerous Errors, 'tis the Part of Charity, to pity and pray for them, to instruct and convince them : And after all, 'tis best to suspend our Opinion or Censure of them, respecting their spiritual State, and leave them to God's Judgment.---- But for what Reason is he of that Mind ?

NEI. He says, " Their Opinion who deny Original Sin, is but a Negative Thing ; they don't yet see, and therefore cannot yet believe, what you suppose taught in the Scriptures." Whereas (says he) " You actually believe and teach that, as a Doctrine of God, which they cannot find in his Word," &c. (p.5.) I would know your Opinion, Sir, whether this Reasoning be just.

MIN. If this Reasoning be just, it will as well fit the *Soci-nians*, who deny the God-head of our blessed Lord, esteeming him a meer Man. They may plead, their Opinion is but a *Negative Thing* : They don't yet see, and therefore cannot yet believe, that the Doctrine of Christ's God-head is taught in the Scriptures : And they, by their Principles, are prompted to charge those who believe it, with Idolatry, in believing on, and worshipping a meer *Creature*. Nay, I see not, but that it will as well suit the *Deist*, or Infidel. His Denial of the Truth of Christianity, or the Gospel of Christ, is also a *Negative Thing* ; he does not yet see the Reasons, and convincing Evidences of it, and therefore does not yet believe it ; and upon his Principles, chargeth Christians with Superstition, and Imposture. But upon our Principles, we are warranted, without Breach of Charity, to pronounce all that believe not in Christ, where the Gospel is preached, to be in a State of Damnation.--- However, the *Question* is not, What Men may upon their Principles charge their Adversaries with ? But, Whether those Principles are justifiable by Reason and Scripture ? And as to this Question of *Original Sin*, I make no Scruple to say, We are more sure of the *Affirmative*, having plain Scripture on our Side, than the Opposers of it can be of the Negative : and how confidently soever they may talk,

6 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

talk, I can't but think, they have their *Fears*, that the plain literal Sense of Scripture, which we found our Doctrine upon, is true. This Gentleman, I perceive, to shew how little those who teach this Doctrine, deserve his Charity, does not offer one Argument from Scripture, to convince us of Error, but only goes about to load it with invidious and fearful Consequences; *ex. gr.* That "it is quite unworthy of God,---tends to abate our Love
"and Esteem of Him, and makes us look upon our Nature as a Misery, rather than an Happiness; so that we
"cannot thank God for our Being," &c. as if it made God the Author of our Nature, as vicious and corrupt. (*ibid.*) Whereby he discovers his Ignorance of our Doctrine of the Corruption of Man's Nature, or makes a wilful Misrepresentation of it, to beget in the Minds of his well-meaning Neighbours, an horror and aversion to it. For it is acknowledg'd by all solid Divines, in treating on this Subject, that our natural Beings, and Faculties, as the Product of the Author of Nature, are good and excellent, and a Demonstration of his Wisdom, and Holiness, and of his discriminating Bounty to Mankind: But that the Vitiosity or Depravity that adheres to them, was originally self-contracted, and is conveyed and propagated to Posterity in the Course of natural Generation. So that we see abundant Cause to be thankful to the Creator for our natural Being, endowed with the excellent Powers of Reason and Understanding, &c. whereby we are capable of bearing his moral Image, and of a blessed Immortality in Communion with him; while at the same time, we see and lament the Defects and Depravations of our Nature, contracted by the first Man's Transgression and Apostacy from God. And this reproachful Insinuation, as if God, being the Author of Nature, must needs be, upon our Principle, the Author of the moral Defects and Corruption of Nature, I find, runs thro' his whole Conference with his Friends, and is repeated on every Occasion that offers: Which might have been prevented, if he had been so ingenuous, as to have distinguished between Nature as it is the Workmanship of God, and Nature as it is mar'd and corrupted by Man's Sin. But the Clearing up this Distinction (how plain and obvious soever) was not for his Purpose with his Friends.

NEI.

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 7

NEI. If you please, Sir, we will wave This at present : it may come again in our Way, in going over the main Subject of the Conference. The Question there, as stated by the Minister, runs thus, *viz.* Whether *We and all Adam's Posterity are charg'd by God with this first Sin of his, so as that Men, Women and Children, are expos'd by this alone to the eternal Damnation of Hell?* To which Question I then replied, "That's my Opinion." But, as I before hinted, I do now suspect I carried the Matter too far, with Respect to *Infants*. And therefore it will be a Gratification to me, if you will please to let me know your Opinion concerning their future State.

MIN. This Question is very unfairly stated. For here are two Questions, in one, of a distinct Nature : *viz.* 1st. Whether *We, and all Adam's Posterity, are charg'd with that first Sin of his?* And 2^{dly}. Whether by this Sin *alone*, Men, Women and Children, are expos'd to the eternal Damnation of Hell? Now this latter is entirely distinct from the former ; and it may be resolv'd into this single Question, *viz.* Whether *Children, dying in Infancy, are expos'd to the eternal Damnation of Hell, for the first Sin of Adam?* Because such as are come to Years of Understanding, have actual Sins, or Sins of their own, to answer for, by which they are liable to the Damnation of Hell ; and such can't be said, by *Adam's Sin alone*, to be expos'd to this Damnation. But as to the eternal Damnation of *Infants*, this is a Question by it self, which does not at all affect the other, concerning the Derivation of Guilt and Corruption from our first Parents Sin and Fall. The former of these Questions is to be *affirmed* : but the latter, *denied* ; at least, with Respect to those who live to adult Age, *Men and Women*, for the Reason before given. The former Question, I say, which respects the Imputation and Derivation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity, is to be *affirmed* of all, *Men, Women and Children*. For Infants may be, and are subject to the penal Consequences of the first Transgression, *viz.* Corruption of Nature, Pain, Sicknes, and Death ; in Respect whereof, it may be truly said to be imputed to them, should they not be thereby subject to eternal Damnation. --- But most of the said Gentleman's Arguments or Objections against the Derivation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity, are rather

8 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

ther pathetick Exclamations against the *Damnation* of *Infants*, or their suffering the Torments of *Hell-fire* :--- A Thing which few or none maintain; even tho' some may suppose them liable to eternal *Death*, that is, an eternal Privation of Life; as they may be, and yet not suffer the Torments of Hell. But hold him to the *first* Question mention'd, and you cut off the Dispute, by more than one half. --- However, whereas you desire to know *my* Tho't concerning the State of *Infants* in another World, let me answer in a Word; *Secret Things belong to God, but Things Revealed belong to us and to our Children.* Divine Revelation is designed for those only, who are capable of understanding, and applying it to it's Ends; and God has not tho't fit so far therein to gratify our Curiosity, as to acquaint us with the Method of his Dealing with *Infants* in a future State: yet, since God sees meet to put a Period to their Lives before they are capable of moral Action, and so to deny them a Space for Probation, which he affords the rest of Mankind, for their eternal State; especially since he has appointed his own incarnate Son to be a second *Adam*, the Redeemer and Head of Men, to recover the Rights and Interests of the human Nature, which were forfeited and lost by the first *Adam's* Apostacy, we have great Reason to hope the best of their State, and no reason to conclude they suffer the eternal Torments of Hell. For aught we know, they may by the Mercy of God thro' the Redeemer be translated from Death to Life.* But after all, This is one of those Things that must be left to the secret Counsel of God. Only as to the Infant-Seed of *Believers*, there are Promises that lay a Foundation for sure Hope of their eternal Salvation.

NEI. But how then shall I get over the Difficulty the said Gentleman has cast in the Way, viz. That "if Infants
" are

* I could therefore wish, that the latter Part of the Answer to the 19th Question of the *Assembly's* Shorter Catechism might be explained, so as not to include those who die in *Infancy*; but to be understood of those only of *Adam's* Posterity, who by indulging their natural Corruption, in actual Transgressions, render themselves liable to the eternal Pains of Hell, as the utmost Degree of Misery consequent on the Apostacy.

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 9

"are charged with Sin, and all Sin is in it's Nature damnable how comes it that they are not damned?"

MIN. The Gentleman himself perhaps can solve this Difficulty, by telling you in what Sense this is not true of all Sin, that it is damnable, i. e. punishable with the Damnation of Hell: For says he, (P. 13.) "We are represented by the Apostle *as having sinned in or by Adam, in some Sense, or other, so as to suffer Death* :---but yet, not *a Word either of Adam or his Posterity suffering eternal Damnation*.--- But how is all Sin in its Nature damnable, if such as have sinned in, or by *Adam* (in what Sense soever) are not on Account thereof expos'd to Damnation? However it is sufficient to reply, tho' all Sin be in its Nature damnable, yet all Sinners are not eventually damned. For what was a Redeemer appointed for, unless to save us from the damnable Effects of Sin?

NEI. 'Tis true, if they *repent*, they are not damned: but he objects, "Without Repentance, there is no Remission of Sin.---If *Infants* are Sinners, they must all perish, according to the Gospel; since they are incapable of Repentance." (P. 6.)

MIN. All Laws suppose the Subjects capable, to whom they are given, and on whom they are obligatory; but the Gospel-Law of Repentance for Remission of Sin, which those only of adult Age are capable of, is not the Rule of the Dispensation of God's Grace to Infants, they being incapable of the actual Performance of the Terms. And yet the Gift of *Regeneration*, which Infants, thro' the Mercy of God, are capable of, supplies the Place of actual Repentance required of the Adult, and fully answers the Intentions of it with Respect to their Salvation.

NEI. He says, (P. 7.) "There is no Hint of any such Thing in the Gospel," as that they should be "forgiven by an absolute Act of Grace."

MIN. If Infants are saved at all, if they belong to that Body of the Redeemed, of which Christ is the Head, and
C Saviour,

Saviour, they must be saved by Him from Sin, being cleansed from their Defilement, in his Blood. (*Eph. 5. 25, 26.*) And if they are so, besure, it must be in a way of Application different from the ordinary Method of Dispensation of Mercy and Salvation, revealed in the Gospel, to Persons capable of the explicit Acts of Knowledge, Repentance and Faith.---But it is safest for you to abide in your Intrenchment, viz. that *secret Things belong to God.*

NEI. But he argues from the Absurdity of the Thing it self. "What an unaccountable Thing must it be," (says he) "for an alwise God, first to put on, and then to "take off this Sin, both without so much as their Knowledge! (*ibid.*)

MIN. Why should this be tho't more absurd, than God's treating all the Children of Adam as Sinners? Which he himself grants, (P. 15.) and which certainly implies an Imputation of Sin to them.----But this Expression of God's putting on the Sin of Adam, is very crude, and harsh, (and I might say, reproachful to our Maker, as if he had an Hand in the Guilt and Corruption that has befallen the human Nature.) The blessed God no otherwise put it on, than by his holy, wise and righteous Constitution at the Beginning, which fix'd the Connection between Guilt and Punishment, Sin and Death, to Adam and his Posterity. By the Violation of which Constitution, Adam brought it on himself, and all his natural Descendants. But since this Gentleman is as confident, that Infants suffer nothing after Death, as if he had a Revelation to assure him of it, and says, (P. 16.) "Present Sufferings and Death may be made up hereafter;" And since we see Sufferings and Death do actually befall Infants, and that by the Hand of God; we may with much better Reason put the Question, (if we durst be so bold with the Counsels and Decrees of God) What an unaccountable Thing must it be, for an alwise God first to put on, and then to take off these Sufferings and Death, both without so much as their Knowledge? And this latter he must do, (viz. take them off) if their Sufferings and Death be made up hereafter. And this putting on, and taking off Sufferings and Death from Infants, are virtually and

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. II

and in Effect, the *putting on*, and *taking off* the Sin of their Nature. Let him extricate himself from this Difficulty, in Answering the latter Question, and we shall find it no hard Matter to Answer the former. And then let him acknowledge, that it is unsufferable Boldness and Rashness, for such poor weak short-sighted Creatures as we are, to call in Question the Wisdom of God's Dispensations, because we are not able to comprehend his Counsels and Designs.

NEI. I am well satisfied, it is safest to leave unrevealed Things to God alone ; and to rest in the plain obvious Sense of Scripture, which to my Understanding makes clearly and fully for the Doctrine of Original Sin : Tho' I know not well how to Answer all that the Subtlety of human Wit can object against it. And one Occasion of this might be, because I have not spent my Thot's so much upon this Doctrine, nor studied so much how to defend it, as others have how to oppose it and run it down. And I am perswaded, that this was the true Reason why my two Neighbours suffer'd themselves to be so easily bro't over to the Minister's Opinion. He started several Objections, that stumbled me a little ; and I did not then know readily what to say to them. Particularly, he ask'd, " Why " must Infants be *Sinners* at all, before they are *moral Agents*, " before they are capable of Good, or Evil," &c. I should be glad to know what you would have Answer'd to this.

MIN. Infants must be suppos'd to have Reason, in the Seeds, and Principles of it ; and consequently the Principles of moral Agency ; otherwise they must be cut off from the Species of reasonable Beings : and by these Principles they are capable both of *Sin* and *Grace*, in the Habits and Principles of them. And if Infants be allow'd to be capable of the *Redeemer's* Grace, the Regeneration of the Spirit unto Holiness, without which they are excluded from Salvation, or an Entrance into the Kingdom of God, by the Sentence of our Saviour (*Joh. 3. 5.*) why should they be tho't incapable of deriving Sin from fallen *Adam*, that is, a depraved and vitious Nature ? That they are not capable of *Doing* Good or Evil, is granted ; but to deny them capable of *Receiving* Good or Evil, even without their Knowledge of either, is to contradict the general Sense of

C 2

Mankind.

12 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

Mankind. But if by *Moral Agents* he means such as are capable of moral Actions, 'tis confess'd, this is requisite to all actual Sins, that those who are capable of committing them, should be moral Agents : and in this Respect, no Body calls *Infants* Sinners, but in Respect of Guilt & Corruption of Nature, derived to them from their first Progenitor, Apostate *Adam*.

NEI. But he represents that as *impossible* ; and says, " There are but two Ways of their being Sinners.---The " first is by natural Generation, or as *Adam* is the *natural* " Parent of us all ; and the other is, as he is our *federal* " Head and Representative." And he undertakes to shew, that in neither of those Ways can the Sin of *Adam* be derived to us, or bro't upon us. And I confess, that under each of these Heads, he has thrown such puzzling Difficulties in the Way, as put me something to a Stand for a while ; and I pray your Assistance to enable me to solve them, if it be not too much Pains, and your Leisure will allow you ; for the main Stress of the Controversy, I perceive lies here.

MIN. I readily afford you what Assistance I can : Your Instructor seems either not to comprehend the Subject he is disputing against, the true Doctrine of the Propagation of the first Sin, or purposely to embarrass it, and to amuse the Minds of his less learned Neighbours, by leading them off from the true State of the Question.- - Those who teach the Derivation of *Adam's* Sin to his Posterity, do not assert, either that it was derived to them by natural Generation, or by virtue of *Adam's* being their natural Parents, nor by virtue of his being their federal Head and Representative, *disjunctively* ; for either of these Ways, consider'd apart from each other, have entangling Difficulties attending them ; but by both in *Conjunction*. And this he might have known, if he had not disdain'd to consult the *Assembly's* shorter Catechism ; where, in Answer to the Question, " Did all Mankind fall in *Adam's* first Transgression ? " They say, " The Covenant being made with *Adam*, not " only for himself, but for his Posterity, all Mankind " descending from him by ordinary Generation, sinned in " him, &c. You see here these two Grounds, as it were enfolded in each other, viz. God's Covenant with *Adam* and his Posterity in him, and their Descent from him by natural

Upon the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 13

natural Generation, as one *complex Reason* (if I may so call it) of the Imputation or Derivation of his Sin to his Posterity. And that is the firm, solid *Basis* of this Doctrine, that will stand the Banter and Cavils of all it's Adversaries. But your Gentleman, it seems, tho't it easier to deal with them apart, than in Conjunction with each other. Can you call to Mind what he objects against either of these Ways, singly considered?

NEI. He mention'd first the Way of "*natural Generation,*" and was sure, that "*this was not sufficient to derive his Sin to us; for if it was, it would derive all his Sins to us, as well as the first, &c.* (P. 7.)

MIN. He says so indeed; and makes one of his Neighbours to reply, "'Tis plain this will not do, and I give it up freely." A very easy Conquest! --- But why might not his Neighbour have replied, This is impossible, Sir, that all *Adam's Sins* should be derived to us by natural Generation; for *Adam* lived after he had begotten *Seth* (the second Father of all Mankind that survived the Deluge) *eight Hundred Years.* (Gen. 5. 4.) Therefore after the Generation of *Seth*, the Sins that *Adam* committed for the following 800 Years, could not possibly be derived to all his Posterity by natural Generation. But tho' I readily agree, it was the first Transgression of *Adam* only; that is derived in regard of the Guilt and penal Consequences of it to his Posterity: yet I don't see what worse Effects would follow on Supposition of the Derivation of all his other Sins, than those brought upon them by his first Sin; the Breach of the Covenant of Innocency, God made with him, whereby the Union between God and Man was entirely dissolved, and consequently, the Life and Image of God in which he was created, or the Integrity, Honour and Happiness of his first Estate, forfeited and lost both for himself and all his Posterity. And does not all Evil and Misery ensue upon this Separation and Alienation from God, which is supposed in the Breach of Union between God and him. It was this first Sin, that was the Sin of the whole human Nature, which has corrupted the whole human Nature, (Corruption of Nature, being the natural and penal Consequent of the Loss of

of

14 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

of God's Image in Holiness and Righteousness) and subjected it to Misery and Death. And what could the Imputation, or Derivation of all *Adam's* other Sins, or the Sins of our intermediate Progenitors, do more than this, consistently with that State of Probation God is pleas'd in his Forbearance to indulge to Mankind in their several Generations? But I am far from thinking this to have been the Case. Man's first Sin alone, his first Breach of Covenant with God, was sufficient to bring on us all this Ruin. But what has the Gentleman reply'd to the second Way he has mention'd, that of *Adam's* being our Covenant-Head and Representative?

NEI. He utterly denied, that he was such an Head; and very confidently demanded, "Where does it appear plain in the *Bible*, that there was any such Covenant made with *Adam*, that he should stand as a federal Head or Representative for all his Posterity; so as that if he sinned, he and all his Posterity should be condemned to Hell-fire for his first Transgression?" (ibid)

MIN. But this latter Part of the Demand, as it relates to *Infants*, dying in Infancy, (for such only, as has been said, can be supposed liable to the Damnation of Hell for *Adam's* first Transgression only) must be set aside, as having nothing to do with the main Question, concerning the Derivation of his Sin to his Posterity. How far the penal Consequences of *Adam's* Sin to them extend, beyond Death, is another Question. But, as your confident Men are apt often to over-shoot the Mark they aim at, so the strong Terms here used, carry the Matter to an extravagant Height, in supposing *Adam* to be such a Representative, as that he sinning, he and all his Posterity should be condemned to Hell-fire for his first Transgression. Which is to be rejected as most absurd; for it would leave fallen Man in as hopeless a State as the fallen *Angels*.---I know of no Man that holds the Doctrine of Original Sin, or maintains that *Adam* was our federal Head, in this Sense. Nor can I conceive why the Gentleman should thus express himself, unless it was to bring an *Odium* on the said Doctrine, and to cast a Slur on all such as espouse it. And indeed it seems too plainly

plainly to have been his Aim in his whole Conference with his Neighbours, by dressing up that Doctrine in the most horrible and frightful Shape, to deter them from embracing it, as tho' all the Maintainers of it were for dooming *Infants*, who die from the Birth, to *Hell-Torments*, to suffer *eternal Damnation*; and were for *Consigning them over to Blackness of Darknes*, to be tormented with *Fire and Brimstone for ever*! For these, and the like *exaggerating Expressions*, I observe, do often occur in that Conference, as if this was an essential Part of the Doctrine of Original Sin, (See Pag. 6, 13, 14, 18, 28, &c.) whereby he grossly misrepresents them, and meanly imposes on his honest Neighbours. But the *main Point in Controversy* is, Whether *Adam* was so constituted by God the Head and Representative of his Posterity, as that he sinning, *his Sin* should be derived or communicated to them, in the *penal Consequences* of it?

NEI. But I was told by the said Gentleman, that "he had *searched the Scriptures* diligently, and could find no such Thing;" and he further added, "*LET ANY MAN IN THE WORLD FIND IT, THAT CAN.*" So that I have a great Desire to hear what *you* have to say upon it.

MIN. I perceive, the *Challenge* is universal; and therefore I suppose, every Man has a Licence given him to search the Scripture, and may without Offence, declare his *Tho'ts* whether or no he can find any such Thing in them.--- But why is it publish'd in *Capitals*, unless it be that all the World might take Notice of it, and that *he who runs may read* it? Or rather, is it not intended as a bidding Defiance to all who are not of his Opinion? As tho' he had said, 'Take my Word for it, tho' you search ever so diligently, you will never find it.' But is it not indeed something *extraordinary* in this Gentleman, that he should not so much as once take the least Notice of the several plain Texts of Scripture, which are alledg'd by many of the most learned Divines in Proof of this very Thing? He should certainly have Answered *These*, and shewed their Insufficiency, before he called for more plain Proofs. I shall endeavour, in Obedience to his Challenge, to exhibit some of those Proofs. Only let me premise, it can't be suppos'd, that

that this mighty Champion of the *Pelagian* Cause should stand forth, and make so bold a Challenge, to all the World, or to any Man in the World that can, to find where it is plainly laid down in Scripture, that *Adam* was appointed to be the *Federal Head and Representative of all his Posterity*; and yet after all this Parade and Flourish, should intend so poor and mean a Thing as that those very Words cannot be found plainly express'd in Scripture, and so make all this Noise expire in meer Vapour; for if this were his Meaning, he might well know, there is none would think it worth while to become his Antagonist. This therefore, I say, can't be suppos'd; but that he means, the Thing signified by those Terms, cannot be made plain from Scripture, and challenges any Man that can, to find it there. Here then, I will venture to join issue with him; and if it cannot be made appear plain in Scripture, or by rational & necessary Consequence from Scripture, that *Adam* was the *federal*, as well as natural Head and Representative of All his Posterity, I freely own, the Whole Doctrine of the Imputation of his Sin to them must fall thro'. And to make this plain, there are but two Things needful to be proved. (1.) That God in Creation constituted *Adam* to be the Grand Patriarch and Progenitor of all Mankind, and consequently their natural Representative: And (2.) That God entred into a Covenant with him in that Capacity. More than this can't be requisite to make it evident, that *Adam* was constituted by God at first to be both the natural and federal Head and Representative of all his Posterity. And both these Positions are plainly to be found in the holy Scripture.

First, God in the Creation of *Adam*, constituted him to be the Grand Patriarch and Progenitor of all Mankind, and consequently their natural Representative. This lies plain in the first Chapter of *Genesis*, ver. 27, 28. *God created Man after his own Image--- Male and Female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the Earth.* Here we see plainly that *Adam* in his first Creation was appointed to be the Head of a Race, of a numerous Offspring, that should replenish the Earth, and branch out into all Nations of the Earth. And hereunto the Apostle refers, when he saith, *Act. 17. 26. God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, for to dwell on all*
the

the Face of the Earth. And being thus constituted the Patriarch and Progenitor of Mankind, he was consequently appointed to be their *natural* Representative: as Parents in common are, by an Ordinance of *Nature*, the Representatives of their Children. And how often do we read, in the old Testament, of *All Israel* being assembled, when only the *Elders*, the *Fathers*, and *Heads* of Tribes and Families were assembled, the whole Body of *Israel* being represented by them? It is not always requisite to constitute a Representative, that he should be chosen by those whom he represents: but some are made such by the Constitution and Order of Nature; so among all Nations, Parents are accounted the natural Representatives of their Children, and allowed to act for them as such. Yea, and according to the order of Nature, the *Man* is the *Head*, and so far the Representative, of the *Wife*. 1 Cor. 11. 3. *The Head of the Woman is the Man.* (See Eph. 5. 23.) And so *Adam*, of *Eve*, and much more of his Posterity. So that there was no Need of a positive Law or Institution, to make *Adam* the Representative of his Posterity. He was made so by the Law of his Nature, being constituted by his Creator the Father of a great Multitude, by that divine Blessing, *Be fruitful and multiply*: and being made capable of propagating his Kind, by this primitive Benediction, the Race of Men from Generation to Generation is continued on the Earth. And this is so plain, that he that denies it, does in effect deny the Derivation of his natural Being from *Adam*, or that *Adam* was our common Father.

Secondly, That God Covenanted with *Adam* in that Capacity, as he was by Creation constituted our common Progenitor, & natural Representative. This is the Thing chiefly oppos'd: but it seems necessarily to follow from the foregoing Position. If *Adam* was constituted by the Law of his Creation the natural Head and Representative of Mankind, they must be included in God's Covenant-Transaction with him. However, this also shall appear as plainly to be found in Scripture as the other. To this Purpose, let those Words of God to *Adam* before the Fall be considered, Gen. 2. 16, 17. *And the Lord God commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the Day*

thou

18 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. In this Passage we find very plainly the Materials of a Covenant between God and *Adam*. To evince this, let me only premise, That God's Covenant with Man, whether before or since the Fall, must not be tho't to agree in all Points with the Covenants of *Men* one with another; because Men having to deal with their fellow-Creatures, stand upon equal Ground, and are generally free from Obligation to each other, before the Contract is made, and may therefore make their own Terms: but God is Man's Creator and Lord, and has an absolute Authority over him; and if God requires of him Obedience to his Will, as a Condition of any Promise, 'tis but what Man is antecedently and originally bound to by the Law of his Creation. Therefore GOD's *Command* and *Promise* to Man constitute the whole *Matter* of his Covenant with him. See here then all the material Requisites of a Covenant. (1.) An exprefs *Command* given to the Man; *The Lord God commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayst freely eat.* And (2.) Here is a *Threatning* added, as a Sanction to the Precept, implying a *Promise* of *Life* in Case of Obedience, *Ver. 17. In the Day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* I say, a *Promise* of *Life*, in Case of Obedience, is necessarily and very plainly imply'd in this *Threatning* of Death, in Case of Disobedience. "For we can't imagine, that God would *threaten* Man with *that*, in Case of Disobedience, which *must* have befall'n him, whether he disobeyed or not." And it is repugnant to the Wisdom and Justice of the Divine Lawgiver, as it tends to vacate the Sanction, or to render it of less Force, and so to weaken the Reins of God's moral Government over Men, if a *Threatning* of Death in Case of Disobedience only might be supposed to leave them no certain *Hope*, or Security of Life, while they persevere in their Duty. When *Solomon* put *Shimei* on his good Behaviour, who had render'd himself obnoxious to Justice in the former Reign, confining him to *Jerusalem*, and saying to him (very much in the same Terms with those in the Text under Consideration) 1 Kin. 2. 37. *On the Day that thou goest out, know for certain, that thou shalt surely die:* Was not here an implicit *Promise* of *Life*, and as full Security for it as he could expect, while he kept

kept within the Bounds prescribed? Was not here Ground of Assurance, that he should *not be put to Death*, unless upon a new Forfeiture? And had Solomon put him to Death, while he abode and behaved well in *Jerusalem*, would not all Men have cried out against it, as an Act of high Injustice? And does not this Conditional Threatning of a wise and righteous God, *In the Day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*, much more import a Promise and full Security for the Continuance of his Life and Happiness, so long as he refrain'd from eating the forbidden Fruit, and continued in his Obedience to his Creator? Yes, most certainly.---Besides, Let me observe to you, we have in these Words what is *more* than an implied Promise of Life to Adam upon Condition of his Obedience, in that liberal Grant God made to him: *Of every Tree in the Garden thou mayst freely eat*. Among which, the *Tree of Life* in the midst of the Garden, was of principal Note: to which, there is no Doubt, God had a special Eye in this Concession; and of that Tree, it is said, *Adam might have eaten of it, and have lived for ever*. This Tree of Life therefore was to Adam, in Innocency, a *Sacrament* or *Pledge* of a blessed Immortality: And in this Grant, *Of every Tree in the Garden thou mayst freely eat*, God doth in effect say to him, *Thou mayest freely eat of the Tree of Life, and live for ever*. So that here is more than a bare Promise of Life, even a Sacrament or Seal for the Confirmation of it.--- These Things, laid together, leave no Manner of Doubt, that there was a *Promise of Life* annex'd to the Precept. And it is worthy of Remark, when the Tenor of the first Covenant is repeated in sundry Passages of Scripture, that Promise of Life upon Obedience is expressed. *Lev. 18. 5. Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 12*. But since the Fall, it is a lost Inheritance: Therefore it may be supposed, the sacred Historian was less express concerning the Promise, than the Threatning, seeing it much more concerns us to know the Wretchedness of our fallen State, than what Happiness we should have had, if Man had not transgressed.

NEI. But I don't find, in this Account you give me, any *Restipulation*, or Engagement on *Man's* Part: how then can it be said to be a *Covenant*: Please to lead me into a Solution of this Difficulty.

MIN. This, I'm aware, is the great Objection with some ; but it will entirely vanish, if you recollect and consider well what I but just now hinted ; that God's Covenant with Men, who are naturally bound to him by the Law of their Creation, is not like the Covenant between Equals among Men, who are antecedently free, but like a Contract between a Master and a Servant, or a Prince and a Subject. If a Master, out of pure Favour, should promise his Servant a certain Privilege, upon his Performance of a Piece of Service he had a Right to command, there is no need that the Servant's Consent should be express'd in Words, to denominate it a Covenant, if it be otherwise signified, to his Master's Satisfaction ; it is implied in his continuing to be a dutiful Servant. God's Command & Promise to Man, are often in Scripture called his Covenant, wherein there is no Consent or Restipulation express'd. Gen. 17. 10. *This is the Covenant which ye shall keep &c.* and elsewhere to the same Purpose. Agreeably we are told, that to transgress the *Commandment* of the Lord, is to transgress his *Covenant*. Josh. 7. 11. *Israel hath sinned, and they have also transgressed my Covenant, which I commanded them.*--- Adam was bound to yield his Consent, by the Divine Command ; and it is as certain, that he did yield it, as that his Will in the State of Integrity was perfectly conformable to the Will of his Creator : if he had refused his Consent to God's Covenant, he had deserved to be treated as a guilty Rebel. Nothing can be argued from the Silence of the sacred Historian, but in Favour of Adam's Consent to this Treaty. For if upon God's propounding this Covenant to him, Adam was silent, and objected nothing to it, this was a tacit Restipulation. He is suppos'd to consent, who holds his Peace, in such a Case. But what is it we would have had Adam consent to ? The *Duty-Part* of the Covenant, Obedience ? He was antecedently bound to obey his Maker ?--- Or, is it the *Promise* ? This was so much to his Advantage, that his reasonable Nature could not but close with it : it was even the Expression of his very *Desires* and *Wishes*.--- And as to the *Threatning*, he could not in Reason object against this ; the Penalty contained in it, being his *just Desert* on Supposition of his Disobedience. Agreeably to what I have now said, the learned
and

and judicious Dr. *Bates* observes; "If God offers a Covenant to the Creature (the Terms being equal, as they always are) it becomes a *Law*; and *Consent* is due, as an Act of *Obedience*. This Consideration alone," says he, "that the *first Covenant* was ordered by GOD, may perfectly satisfy all Enquiries."

NEI. I am now fully answered, and convinced, as to that Point. I am full in it, the Obligation was certainly mutual. And I think, nothing more needs be said, to make it plain from Scripture, that there was a *Covenant*, which pass'd between God and Man in his first Creation. But the Enquiry that now remains, and seems to be attended with more Difficulty, is, Whether *Adam's Posterity* were concerned and included in this Covenant, equally with himself? Or, whether God covenanted with *Adam* both for himself and for his Posterity?

MIN. This, I conclude, must undeniably follow from the Premises. --- If God covenanted with *Adam* as the great Patriarch of Mankind, their common Progenitor and Representative, and he could be considered under no other Capacity in that solemn federal Transaction, then the Covenant God made with him, included all his natural Descendants; so that the Covenant was made with *Adam*, and with all Mankind in him. For in Covenanting with *Adam*, or (if you will) with our *first Parents*, who were all Mankind then existing, God comprehended in his Covenant the whole human Kind; who were all in them *Seminally*, and *Representatively*, or as the Plant and Branches in the Root. All Mankind, as many as they be, are but *Adam* multiplied. The foresaid Gentleman takes Notice of this, as an *Objection*, that "we were all in him," (P. 10.) i. e. in him when the Covenant was made with him, and when he fell by his first Transgression; to which he makes but a shuffling Reply, and propounds some ludicrous silly Questions, that deserve no Regard. --- However, I shall endeavour to make this also plain from Scripture, and scriptural Reasons, that God covenanted with the first Man, not only for himself, but for all his natural Posterity. Tho' there is no express mention of this in the Text of *Moses*, yet

yet it is necessarily implied in his Narrative of Man's primitive State ; and the whole Doctrine of Scripture takes it for granted. --- Because I would not be tedious to you, I shall offer only a few Hints in Proof of this.

(1.) We may observe to this Purpose, that God's *Transactions* with *Adam* before the Fall, and the *Words* he spake to him, both in his Benediction and Command, were *not peculiar* to the Person of *Adam*, but concerned the *whole human Kind*. So, in that Blessing of Multiplication, *Gen. 1. 28.* 'Tis by virtue of this Divine *Benediction*, that the Species of Men have been propagated, and multiplied to this Day. Accordingly, what is said of the *first Man* (*Gen. 2. 18.*) *The Lord God said, It is not good that the Man should be alone : & that, ver. 24. Therefore shall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and shall cleave unto his Wife, &c.* these Sayings concern all his Posterity. And no Reason can be given, why we should not in the same Sense understand the *Command* given (*ver. 16, 17.*) as affecting all his Posterity. *The Lord commanded the Man ---* Hebr. *Haadam*, rendred appellatively *the Man*, being the Name of the *Species* ; tho' it be express'd in the singular Number, yet that *Eve* was included, there is no Doubt : and that *Eve* understood the Command to be given to *her*, as well as to *Adam*, appears from her Answer to the *Serpent*, *Gen. 3. 3. Of the Fruit of the Tree that is in the midst of the Garden, God hath said, YE shall not eat of it, --- lest ye die.* And if we understand the Creation of *Eve* to follow in the Order of *Moses's* Narration (as this Gentleman seems confident it doth, *Pag. 12.*) then it will appear to be no strange Thing, for Persons to be included in a Covenant of God with Man, who did not personally exist when the Covenant was made ; for it is certain, that *Eve* takes her self to be included. However, I insist not on this, because there may possibly be a Transposition of this Part of *Moses's* History ; but then, what God is here said to speak only to the *Man*, must be understood to relate to *all Mankind*, and by Consequence must include the *Woman* ; who, and her Husband, were all Mankind then in Being, and the Root of the whole Offspring of Men.

(2.) Let it be considered, that in all God's *other Covenants* with Men, He hath ever dealt with *Parents* and their *Children*, or those that should spring from their Loins, as
with

with the *Root* and *Branches* together. Thus he covenanted with *Noah* and his Family, *Gen.* 6. 18. & 9. 9. With *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. With *David*, and his House, *2 Sam.* 7. 16. And in the like Tenor the *Evangelical Covenant* runs, *Act.* 2. 30.---And let me further add, that God is often said in Scripture, to covenant with Parents and their Children, not only of the *present* Generation, but such also who are as yet *unborn*. God covenanted, and promised to *Abraham*, to give the Land of *Canaan* for a Possession to his Seed after him, when as yet he had no Child, *Act.* 7. 5. Therefore as to the Objection, that we were not *present* when *Adam* was made our Representative, and so could not consent to the Choice; I say, notwithstanding this, he might and did represent them. What is more common, than for one that is *present*, to stand for and represent a large Number of *absent* Persons? --- Yea, such as are *absent* may be and have been Parties in Covenant with GOD; as appears from *Deut.* 29. 14, 15. *Neither with you only do I make this Covenant, and this Oath --- but also with him that is not here with us this Day.* And agreeably in *Chap.* 5. 2, 3. *The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in Horeb: The Lord made not this Covenant with our Fathers (exclusive of their Posterity) but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this Day.* These Words were delivered by *Moses*, near 40 Years after the Children of *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt*, and the Giving of the Law at Mount *Horeb*; and at this Time, most (if not all) of the Men that came out of *Egypt* (except *Caleb* and *Joshua*) were dead. And yet, says *Moses*, *The Lord made this Covenant with us, even with us, who are all of us here alive this Day.* And these were the Children of those Men with whom the Lord covenanted in *Horeb*; the most of which Children were then *unborn*. So that Persons, though absent, yea, though not yet born, may be included in a Covenant made with their Progenitors. Now, according to the Analogy of such other Covenant-Transactions of God with Men, who come into Being successively by Generation, we are in all Reason to understand this Covenant made with *Adam*, as being not only for himself, but for his Posterity, for all Mankind that should spring from his Loins by natural Generation.

(3.) That this Covenant was made with *Adam*, and all Posterity in him, appears from the *Event*, or what has befallen

24 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

fallen Mankind through our first Parents Breach of this Covenant. And here I might instance in the Traduction or Derivation of a *Nature* corrupt, sinful and vicious, from *Adam*. That Mankind are born into the World under corrupt Biasses, and vicious Inclinations, which are very early discovered, not only the Scripture teaches, but it is also Matter of Fact and universal Experience. But I wave this, as being a Point in Controversy; tho' I look upon it as the first and principal Effect of the first Sin, and which is necessarily implied in, or infer'd from, the *Imputation* of that Sin to the natural Progeny of fallen *Adam*.---However, I may be allowed to argue from this Gentleman's own Concession (P. 8.) That *one Man's Sin* may be made another's,---if he approves or winks at it afterwards. Now this is certainly our Case. We do all naturally allow & approve of *Adam's* Delinquence and Disobedience. Do not even Children, as soon as capable of moral Action, plainly discover, that they (practically at least) approve of, and consent to *Adam's* Breach of Covenant and Rebellion against God, as to every Branch and Article of it, in their Proneness to the same Kind of Sins? And now, how comes this about, if we have not a corrupt *Nature*? And whence should all Mankind derive this corrupt Nature, if not from fallen *Adam*? And why from him, if he be not our federal, as well as natural Head?--- But I choose to argue from the more manifest, and undeniable Effects of the first Sin, the suffering of *Death*, with the Evils and Miseries that precede and attend it; that *Penalty* of the Violation of this Covenant, which affects all Mankind. The Threatning of *Death* takes hold of all for the Sin of the first Man. Rom. 5. 12. *By one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin, and so Death hath passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* It is here obvious to every vulgar Capacity, without any need of a Comment, that the Reason the Apostle gives, why *Death* has pass'd upon all Men, *Infants* not excepted (nay, these are especially design'd by those who have not sinned after the Similitude of *Adam's Transgression*, ver. 14.) is, *because all have sinned.* *Infants*, therefore, most certainly die, because they have sinned in *Adam*. (So *Beza* and others render it, in whom (*viz.* *Adam*) all have sinned) For otherwise they could not have sinned. And if *Infants* die in Infancy because they have sinned

in *Adam* (not actually, but representatively) then all Mankind are liable to Death in their *Infancy*, on the same Account. For no Reason can be given why Death passes upon *Infants*, that does not equally affect all Mankind: Whence that Conclusion is indisputable, that we all sinned in *Adam*, in his first Transgression. It follows therefore, that he represented us in that Covenant, for the Violation whereof Death was denounced as the Penalty. --- And I may further add, that the *Doom* pass'd on our first Parents after their Transgression, with Respect to temporal Evils and Miseries, reaches all Mankind, their natural Descendants. --- That on the *Woman*, Gen. 3. 16. *In Sorrow shalt thou bring forth Children*---this Punishment was not personal, or peculiar to our first Mother, *Eve*: but affects all her Daughters in the like Condition. --- That on the *Man* affects the Sons of *Adam* in common, ver. 17, 18. *Cursed is the Ground for thy Sake; in Sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the Days of thy Life*---*In the Sweat of thy Face shalt thou eat Bread, till thou return to the Ground*.---Now, if the Punishment of the violated Covenant be inflicted on all the Posterity of *Adam*; if they are all subject to the same penal Evils, that their Father *Adam* was doom'd to for his first Transgression; is it not manifest, to all such as will but open their Eyes, that they must be some way involved in his Sin, and be said to have *sinned in him*, in order to their being legally Sufferers of the Penalty of it? And if so, it is an undeniable Consequence, that they were *represented* by him in the first Covenant, which God made with him; the Violation whereof brought this Guilt and Punishment on him and them.

(4.) I shall add one more Evidence of this Truth, yet more plain and convictive, if possible; and that is the *Parallel*, instituted in way of Opposition, between *Adam* and *Christ*, or between the first and last *Adam*, which is observ'd in sundry Passages of the New-Testament. Particularly, 1 Cor. 15. 22. *As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive*. As, through the Sin of *Adam*, all Men, partaking of a sinful corrupt *Nature*, derived from him, become mortal, and die; so through the Merit and Power of *Christ*, all that partake of his spiritual and holy *Nature*, by Union to him, shall be rais'd to an immortal Life. And 'tis observable, ver. 47. *Adam* is called the *first Man*; and *Christ*,

26 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

the *second Man*: As if there were no more than these *two Men* in the World. Now, in what other Sense can this possibly be understood, than that these *two Men* were all *Men representatively*; *Adam*, the first Man, representing all his degenerate Race, subject to Corruption and Mortality; *Christ*, the second Man, representing all his regenerate Seed, redeemed and restored by him to a spiritual, immortal Life.--- The Parallel is pursued more at large by the Apostle in many Verses together, *Rom. 5*. Where *Adam* is expressly called *the Type of Christ*; *the Figure of him that was to come*, i. e. *Christ*. And wherein the one was the *Type* of the other, is clearly set forth in the following Verses to the End of the Chapter, *viz.* as each of them sustain'd the Character of a publick Person. *Adam* and *Christ* are exhibited as the two *Heads* of Mankind: *Adam*, of all the *Apollate* World, over whom Death reigns, thro' his Transgression; *Christ*, of all the restored World, who obtain Justification of Life, thro' his Righteousness. *ver. 15. If thro' the Offence of one, many be dead, much more the Grace of God, and the Gift by Grace, which is by one Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.*---- *Adam* is an Head that imparts Sin and Death to his Offspring, so that as soon as any become Members of the *First Adam*, by natural Generation, they Share in the Guilt of his Breach of Covenant, and become liable to the penal Consequences of it, comprehended in the Term, *Death*: But *Christ* is an Head that conveys Righteousness and Life to his Members, and as soon as any become his Members by spiritual Regeneration, and are united to him by Faith, they Share in the Merit of his Obedience, which procures for them Pardon, Justification, and Life everlasting. To this Purpose it follows, *ver. 18. As by the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men unto Condemnation; even so by the Righteousness of one, the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life.* And *ver. 19. For as by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners, so by the Obedience of one, shall many be made Righteous.* Here it is not only directly and expressly asserted, that Sin and Death are communicated from *Adam*, to all his Posterity; *through the Offence of one, many are dead*: and the Reason is given, *ver. 19. For by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners.* And there is no Manner of Reason, or Necessity, that we should

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 27

should recede from the plain literal Sense of the Words, which correspond so well with the History in *Genesis*, and with all other Parts of Scripture--I say, 'tis not only asserted, that we have Sin and Death communicated to us from *Adam*, which alone had been sufficient to prove, that he stood as our Representative in the Covenant God transacted with him in *Paradise*: But moreover, by this Comparison between *Adam* and *Christ*, the Ground of this Communication is more fully explained; which is *Adam's* sustaining the Character of a common Person, or general Head to his Posterity, as *Christ* did to all his Seed. For these several Conveyances, of Sin and Death, on *Adam's* Part, and of Righteousness and Life, on *Christ's* Part, are founded on a federal Constitution: According to which, as *Christ* was made the Head and Representative of his spiritual Seed, all true Believers, by Virtue whereof, what he did and suffered, is imputed, for their Benefit; So *Adam*, by a like federal Constitution, was made the common Head and Representative of his natural Seed. Whence it comes to pass, that as if *Adam* had stood, they should have enjoyed the Benefit of it, so he falling by Transgression, his Breach of Covenant is imputed unto them, respecting all the penal Consequences of it.---And likewise, that as *Christ* appeared and acted in the Character of the great Patriarch of Men, the *Second Adam*, and our common Head, and Representative; so on this Ground it is, by our Union to him, we come to Share in the Benefits of his Merit and Purchase: which are Truths, that I hope none among us will deny; and they may be sufficiently proved by numerous, plain, incontestible Passages of Scripture.---Therefore *Adam's* being parallel'd with *Christ*, as to the Reason and Ground of his Conveyance of Sin and Death to his Posterity---(without admitting which, there can be no sound consistent Exposition of the Paragraph before us; tho' I own, the Apostle's Design is rather to illustrate the Conveyance of Grace and Righteousness by *Christ*, yet they mutually serve to illustrate each other. For when it is said, "As by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners, so by the Obedience of one, shall many be made Righteous," the Argument from the Comparison is of equal Force on the other Side; thus "As by the Obedience of one, shall

E 2 " many

28 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

"many be made Righteous, so by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners")--I say, *Adam's* being thus parallel'd with Christ, in the fore-mentioned Respects, makes it abundantly plain, that *Adam* stood as a *public Person*, or a *federal Head* and *Representative*, for his Posterity; which is the thing challenged to be proved from Scripture.---And here I have a fair Occasion given for *retorting* this Gentleman's fine Language;---"How infatuated must Men be," and blinded "with Prejudice" in favour of their darling Schemes (especially such as pretend to have "search'd the Scriptures diligently") not to be able to see, "in the three first Chapters of *Genesis*, any thing of "such a *Covenant* made with *Adam*, or his being made such "a *Representative* for his Posterity,"---after so much Light has been reflected on them by the Writings of the New Testament, particularly the Passages now cited! I know of no Truth or Doctrine of Religion, not deliver'd in express Terms in Scripture, which can be made out more plainly, or convincingly, from Scripture-Testimonies, than this.

NEI. I acknowledge, what you have discoursed of God's Covenant with *Adam*, and all his Posterity in him, as their Representative, to be very agreeable to my Sentiments: and you have made it clear and evident from the holy Scriptures, so as (I think) must be abundantly to the Satisfaction of all unprejudiced Persons. And I cannot but wonder, that such as profess to be govern'd by divine Revelation, as their Rule in all Matters of Faith, should not acquiesce in the plain Meaning of many of those Texts you have alledged; which lies open to the common Sense and Reason of Mankind, and has been generally received in the Christian Church, so far as I can understand, in all Ages. Tho' the Things revealed may transcend our Capacity, and be difficult to explain, yet the Words and Expressions, by which they are revealed, are very clear and plain to my Understanding.

MIN. I can think of no other Reason, but because they find, those plain Texts of Scripture obviously clash with their preconceived Schemes and Notions. This puts them upon seeking out new Methods of Interpretation, more favourable to them. But indeed is this to make the
Scripture

Scripture their Rule of Faith? Nay, rather their own imperfect and fallible Reason is hereby made the Rule of Scripture. 'Tis good Advice the Minister gives you (P. II) "Alway to distinguish between the *Word of God*, & *your Sense* "and Interpretation of that Word." And why not as well *his* Sense and Interpretation of it, unless he sets up for *Infallible*!--Remember that, and you will be in no great Danger of erring; for you will always have more Reason to suspect a far-fetch'd Sense of a Text, than that which lies more obvious to common Understanding, being consistent with the Context, and the Tenor of other Scriptures.---But I must here by the Way observe, that the *Papists* are very much beholden to this Gentleman, for asserting, that "*Transubstantiation*" (to which he very disingenuously and invidiously compares the Doctrine of *Original Sin*) "may be proved by a Number of *plain express* Texts, by admitting the Words, *This is my Body*, &c. to be a *plain express* Proof of it.---However, he is mistaken; for how *express* soever that Text is, the *plain* Sense of it is the figurative one, & not the literal; for allowing a Figure in the Text, does not make the Sense less plain: So the Proof it affords, is rather against *Transubstantiation*. For Christ being then bodily present with the Disciples, and saying of the Bread, *This is my Body*, they could not possibly understand him (nor can we at this Day) to intend his natural Body, but only a *Representation* of it. There are many Expressions in Scripture, and in common Speech, whereof the *literal* Meaning is absurd and unintelligible; but the *figurative* Sense is the plain and true Sense. I see no Absurdity at all in our Doctrine of *Original Sin* (as this Gentleman imagines) when rightly stated and explained.

NEI. But tho' the Imputation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity be, beyond all reasonable Doubt, a plain Doctrine of Scripture, or a Doctrine plainly founded on Scripture, yet it is a very humbling Doctrine, which the Pride of Man's Nature cannot easily digest, and this puts Men upon setting their Wits at work to oppose and cry it down; and those that do so, are too apt to make it the Matter of their Ridicule and Scoff; which I think to be contrary to that Modesty and Reverence, with which sacred Things, especially
of

30 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

of such Importance as this is, ought to be treated. But besides these, there are others of a more serious Temper, who are sometimes a little stumbled at the Difficulties started about it; and divers sober Persons, of my Acquaintance, who are so far from being Enemies to the Doctrine of Original Sin, that they profess to believe it on the Warrant of plain Scripture-Revelation, yet are not able fully to satisfy themselves how it is consistent with the Wisdom and Justice of God, to appoint *Adam* the Representative of his whole Race, so as to involve them all in the fatal Effects of his Miscalriage, by a meer *arbitrary* Act of his Will, when he might, if he had pleased, have order'd it *otherwise*.

MIN. This is doubtless a great Mistake. God's Appointment of *Adam* to be our Representative, in his covenanting with him, was not a meer *arbitrary* Act of the divine Will: But 'twas an Appointment founded on a *natural Constitution*, or (as I may say) a *Necessity of Nature*: And, as far as Things appear to us, it could not have been ordered *otherwise*, consistently with the Designs of God's Wisdom, in the Creation of Man.

NEI. If this can be made to appear, it will go a great way towards removing the Scruples and Doubts, with which many honest Minds are perplex'd in this Affair.

MIN. I shall readily endeavour your Satisfaction. But let me first observe, that the Gentleman with whom you had that Conversation, in his Discourse about the Derivation of Sin from *Adam*, seems not to have understood the *Difference* between the Imputation of *Adam's* Guilt to his Posterity, and the Propagation or Conveyance of a sinful corrupt Nature to them; and therefore he argues indistinctly and confusedly, sometimes against the one, and sometimes against the other. Whereas, they are really *distinct*, and are considered as such by all sound Divines in treating on this Subject; the former being term'd *Original Sin imputed*, and the latter, *Original Sin inherent*. Indeed, tho' distinct, they are inseparably *connected*, and ever go along with each other. What this Gentleman has objected against the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, has been chiefly consider'd in vindicating

dicating his Appointment to be our federal Head. But you may remember, I observ'd to you, that the *Ground* of the Derivation of *Adam's* Sin to his natural Offspring (whether it be understood of the Imputation of his Guilt, or the Propagation of his corrupted Nature to them) is neither his being the natural Parent or Root of all Mankind, nor his being their federal Head or Representative, considered *singly* and *apart* from each other; but both, in *Conjunction*, are requisite to make out a sufficiently clear, and justifiable Ground of the Imputation of his Sin to them. And therefore this Gentleman, in suggesting that *Adam's* being constituted our federal Head is the *Foundation* of the *whole Scheme* of the Imputation of his Sin, (P. 7.) if he means the *only* Foundation, he is much mistaken; and his two Neighbours too, whom he had gained to vote agreeable to his Sentiment.---That there was a divine Appointment of *Adam* to be our *federal* Head, and that this was *one* Ground of the Imputation of his Sin, has been asserted, and proved. Yet I am far from thinking, this was the *only* Ground; for another Ground was his being consider'd as our *natural* Head, the common Parent of all Mankind by natural Generation, or the Root and Fountain of the human Nature, to all his Posterity. Hence it is observable, that Corruption of Nature, which is the inseparable Concomitant of the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, the Scripture attributes to natural Generation, and speaks of it as what we have by Nature, by Birth, by natural Descent from *Adam*. (*Eph.* 2. 3. *Joh.* 3. 6. *Joh.* 25. 4. *Psal.* 51. 5. and elsewhere.) So that tho' *Adam* was appointed our *federal* Head, yet it was an Appointment founded on a Law of *Nature*, whereby he was made our *natural* Head; and the Covenant made with him, by the Violation whereof Guilt and Corruption are derived to his Offspring, was a *natural* Covenant, suited to the Nature of Man in his Integrity, and made with the *whole* human Nature in *Adam*. Therefore we are not to consider this Constitution of *Adam* to be our Representative, in God's Covenant with him, or in his Sin and Fall, as founded on a meer *positive* Law, or a meer Act of *Prerogative*; no, I can't be perswaded that God would have involved all Mankind in Condemnation by an Act of meer *Sovereign* Prerogative; but that he is unexceptionably *Just* in all his Dealings with
Adam,

132 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

Adam, and with all Mankind in Consequence of his Transgression. Hence *Judgment* is said to come by the Offence of one, Rom. 5. 16, 18. which speaks a *righteous* Dispensation from God ; but the Constitution of *Adam* to be a publick Person, representing his Posterity, and acting for them, is to be resolved into a Principle of the *Law of Nature*, that he should propagate his *Nature*, and beget in his own *Image* and *Likeness*. And the Imputation of the first Man's Sin to his Posterity, which is a Doctrine that many find so difficult to digest, being viewed in this Light, will appear to be according to the Constitution and Course of *Nature* : So that they who murmur at this, that *Adam* should be appointed their *Representative*, without their Choice or Consent,---that they should stand or fall in him, ---do in effect repine at his being made their common *Progenitor*, and murmur that they should derive their Beings by *natural Generation* from him, without their Choice or Consent. God's Choice and Appointment of *Adam* to sustain this Capacity and Character with respect to his Posterity, was every way wisest and fittest ; and to be offended at this Doctrine, is to be offended at the *Natural* Constitution of Things, settled by the only wise God, from the Beginning. (But *he that reproveth God, let him answer it.* Job 40. 2.)---I might go on further to illustrate and confirm what I have asserted ; but I fear the Time you have allotted for this Visit, will scarce permit any further Enlargement here.

NEI. If you can spare the Time, Sir, I'm quite easy ; I desire no better Entertainment ; 'tis a Subject I should be glad to hear further explained, and the rather since that Gentleman (I remember) amidst his other warm invectives against Original Sin, was carried out to such an excess of Vehemence, as to assert, that this Doctrine "supposes
" God to make Millions Sinners, by his Decree of Imputation,
" who would otherwise have been innocent.---That it was
" God's Decree alone, which made all *Adam's* Posterity Sinners,
" (he said) is the very Essence of this Doctrine." (P. 27.) Directly contrary to what you are asserting.

MIN. A very heavy Charge indeed ! But it is a base Calumny. To pass by his Blunder, in speaking of the De-

free as that which makes Sinners ; whereas, they that understand any thing of the *Decrees*, know that a Decree puts nothing into Act. To pass this by, I say, he might have been ask'd, Was it the Decree, that made the *first* Man a Sinner ? This surely will not be said ; then neither was it the *Decree*, which made any of his *Posterity* such : No, nor *Imputation* neither. Imputation supposes Sin, but does not make Sinners. That which made all Mankind Sinners, was the Sin of the *first* Man, from whom they derive their *Nature*, by Virtue of a righteous Constitution of God, against which he sinned, and which was founded on a Law of *Nature*, and not framed by a meer *arbitrary* Decree of the divine Will.---This is the Thing I was about to illustrate and prove. To that End, let it be considered,

(1.) That in the primitive Constitution of *Nature*, God appointed Mankind to come into Being successively by *Generation*, as the several living Creatures on Earth propagate their *Species*. And this was the great Difference between Mankind and Angels, at the Beginning. The *Angels*, we suppose, were created all at once, and did *co-exist personally* at the same Time, and so were capable of being personally treated with ; and those of them that sinned and fell, were *actual* Offenders, and *personally* guilty, sinning by an Act of their own Will. Whereas, Mankind by the Law of their Creation were to come into Being in successive Generations : the first Couple only being produced by *Creation* ; all the rest were to spring from them by natural Propagation, by being *begotten* and *born*. Act. 17. 26. *He hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men*. Our first Parents had in them all the Blood of Mankind ; that is, all the human Nature was in them : All the Generations of Men were *seminally* in their Loins.

(2.) It being God's Pleasure to deal with Man in the Way of a *Covenant*, it was necessary, by this primitive Constitution of *Nature*, that he should deal with *Adam* as the common *Head* and *Representative* of his whole Race. God in his infinite Wisdom saw it the fittest Method of treating Man, as a reasonable Creature and Subject of moral Government, to deal with him in a *federal* Way, by Promises and Threatnings, made to engage him to Obedience. And this Way of Government by a *Covenant*, was in it's own
F Nature

34 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

Nature conducive to the *Benefit* of Mankind. Wherefore the Constitution of *Adam*, as a common *Head* to his Posterity in this Covenant, was evidently founded on a *natural Necessity*; or on that *Law of Creation*, whereby of *one Blood* all Nations of *Man* were to be derived by Generation, to the End of the World. 'Twas not by a meer *positive Law*, or Institution, that *Adam* was made their Head, but by a *natural Law*. 'Tis therefore groundless and needless, to suppose a *distinct Covenant* made with *Adam* about his undertaking for his Posterity. Herein indeed is the Difference between *Adam* and *Christ*, that God made a *distinct Covenant* with the latter, about his undertaking the Work of our Redemption, called by Divines the *Covenant of Redemption*, or of *Suretyship*: And the Reason is plain, because the whole Work of our Redemption depends on a meer *sovereign Act* of the Divine Will, in which God is pleased to go out of the Road of *Nature*, and in a Way of *free Grace*, treats with his Son about the Method of restoring fallen Man; But in treating with *Adam*, there was no Necessity of going out of the Road of *Nature*. All God's Dispensations to Mankind in *Adam*, were founded on the Law of his Nature. Therefore, in comparing these several Conveyances from *Adam*, and from *Christ*, the former is denominated *Judgment*; for God's procedure with Man herein is in a Way of *Justice*, according to *Law* and *Right*, and not in a Way of *sovereign Prerogative*: whereas, the latter is termed *Grace*, and the *free Gift*. (Rom. 5. 16, 18.) For in Redemption all is of *Grace*, a perfectly free and voluntary Dispensation. But God, as the Author of *Nature*, had constituted *Adam* to be the Progenitor of all the rest of Mankind; so that he needed not do it by a *positive Law*, or *distinct Covenant*. *Adam* knew, by the *Benediction* of God in his Creation, that he was appointed to be the *Head* of a Race of Men. (Gen. 1. 28.) And hereby he might know also, that God's Dealings with him had not only an immediate Respect to his own Person, and his own Benefit, but also to the Persons and Benefit of all Mankind, who should issue from him; and that the Fate of all his Posterity depended on his Conduct. These things *Adam* might have sufficient Notice of by the Light of Nature: and these were enough to determine him and point him out as their Head and Representative.

(3.) It was also by a Law of *Nature*, that *Adam* was appointed to convey *his own Image* to his Posterity, whether it were *holy* and good, or *sinful* and corrupt. For God, as the Author of *Nature*, had made this the *Law* of *Nature*, that Man should beget *in his own Likeness*. And this Law was not proper to Man only, but in the first Constitution of *Nature*, was given to all the Creatures that were made for Propagation, even to Plants and Herbs of the Field. As we see, Gen. 1. 11, &c. They were to *yield Seed* and *Fruit after their Kind*; and the Cattle and all living Creatures were to bring forth *after their Kind*. This was the Law of Generation, given to all without Exception, that Like should beget his Like. And according to the original natural Law, Man begets *in his own Image* and *Likeness*. If his *Nature* had remained holy and good, he had brought forth that which is holy and good: but being corrupted and vitiated, he can convey nothing but a Nature corrupt and vicious. "It is the universal and unchangeable Law of Nature," says Dr. BATES, "that every Thing produce its *Like*; not only in Regard of the same *Nature*, that is propagated from one *Individual* to another, without a Change of the *Species*; but in Respect of the *Qualities*, with which that *Nature* is eminently affected. Thus our Saviour tells us (*Matth. 7. 18.*) That the *Fruit* partakes of the *Rottenness* of the *Tree*. And whatever is born of the *Flesh*, is *Flesh*. *Joh. 3. 6.*"---Hence it follows,

(4.) That the Derivation of *Adam's Guilt* to his Posterity is founded on a Law of *Nature*; the same Law, by which they derive their *Nature* itself from him; the Law, that Man should beget *in his own Likeness*. Tho' I have considered the *Covenant*, in which *Adam* was appointed our Representative, as one Ground of the Imputation of his Sin, yet I have also shewed that this Appointment was founded on a natural Constitution. The whole human Nature was reposed in *Adam*, to be conveyed in the Method of natural Generation, to his Posterity. He sinning and falling before this Conveyance actually took Place, hence the whole *Nature* became guilty and corrupted, and is so derived; for he could propagate nothing better than his own Image. Gen. 5. 3. *Adam begat a Son in his own Likeness, after his Image.*---But it is to be observed, that it is not meer Gene-

36 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

ration, that makes any Man sinful ; which, as it is the Work of God, and Nature, is good : But 'tis the *first Sin*, transmitted by Generation, which is only the *Means* of it's Conveyance. The whole human Nature, as guilty and corrupt in the Fountain of it, flows down to us thro' the Channel of natural Generation. So that we need not trouble ourselves with the Question, which is much disputed by some, with reference to the Doctrine of the Propagation of *Adam's Sin*, Whether the *Soul* be by Traduction from *Adam*, in the Way of Generation, or by immediate Creation of God, in the Body ? For if it be immediately created by God, how comes it to partake of, or be defiled with *Adam's Sin* ? This Difficulty I find' started by the said Gentleman ; whereby he thinks he has puzzled the Cause : But all he says upon it, is beside the Purpose. For however that *Question* be resolv'd, it makes Nothing to the present Case. Because, be it granted, that the *Soul* is immediately produced by a divine Operation ; yet we are not to conceive it as existing a Moment *before* it's Union to the *Body* : But it is produced in the Body, organically disposed to receive it, in the Course of natural Generation. And by the *Law of Generation*, settled at first, Man was to beget a Man *in his own Likeness*, both in Body and Soul. And by the Concurrence of *natural Providence*, in the Formation of the Soul, God works according to this settled Law of *Nature*, and not by Prerogative. So that the *same* natural Providence, which would have concur'd in the Act of Generation, for conveying an *holy* Nature, had Man continued holy, doth also concur in conveying a *corrupt* Nature, now he is fallen and corrupted. This Law of Generation being settled by God in the first Creation of Man, *before* ever Sin entered, it is not reasonable, that he should *alter* the established Course of *Nature* because of Man's Sin. Nor is there, hence, the least Ground of impeaching the *Holiness* of God, any more than in asserting the same general Concurrence of natural Providence in all the *sinful Actions* of Men ; without which Concurrence, they could neither live nor act any thing at all. If this be not satisfactory, but Men will still cavil on, and be raising curious Questions about this Matter, *not knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm* ; let inspired *Solomon* answer them in one Word.

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 37

Word. Eccl. 11. 5. *As thou knowest not what is the Work of the Spirit, nor how the Bones do grow in the Womb of her that is with Child, even so thou knowest not the Works of God, who maketh all.* Let none then cavil, and say, It seems unjust to them, that they should be reputed to have sinned in Adam, without their previous Consent; they may as well cavil at their being begotten and born Men and Women from Adam, without their Consent first had. God's Appointment of Adam to be our common Head, and Representative, considered as founded on a Constitution or Law of Nature, may serve forever to vindicate the Justice of God in the Imputation of his first Sin, from whom we derive his depraved and corrupt Image, on the same Terms that we derive our natural Beings from him.---I have insisted the more in clearing up this Point, because I apprehend it to be of great Use for detecting the Sophistry of the Adversaries of this Doctrine.

NEI. And I hope it may be also of great Service to the Friends of this Doctrine: for I confess, you have set this Point of the Reasonableness and Justice of the Imputation of the first Sin, in such a Light as I had not so fully consider'd it in before; and I think, such as must needs give great Satisfaction and Ease to the Minds of those that are exercised with Scruples about it.---And in doing this, I am glad you have answered that *Objection*, which is commonly made, and which is espoused by the said Minister, (P.8.) that "*Adam was not chosen by us,*" &c.---Nor do I see why it may not with as much Shew of Reason be objected, that because the Lord JESUS was not *chosen by us* to be our Lord-Redeemer, therefore we will not venture our Salvation in his Hand, but will rather *go about to establish our own Righteousness*, and seek to be our own Saviours; which would prove in the issue nothing short of *being our own Destroyers*.---For my own Part, I receive it as an Article of my Creed, that God appointed both *Adams*, the first and the second *Man*, to be publick Persons, or the federal Heads and Representatives of their respective Seeds. And therefore, as I derived Guilt and Defilement from the first Adam, so I humbly look for Righteousness and Grace from the last Adam.---And moreover, whereas the said Gentleman says, (*ibid.*) "*There*

38 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

is not one Instance in the World, where one Man's Sin is made another's, who did not approve or wink at it afterwards,"--It appears to me, that this (as you observed before) is evidently and undeniably *our own Case*; and therefore in this *Concession* of his, he has, I think, by a just Consequence *given up the Point*.--- Yet after all you have said to prove *Adam* to have been a *public Person*, and federal Head to his Posterity, this Gentleman will not agree to the *Consequence*, that his Sin is *imputed* to them; but asks (P. 8.) "How would
 " this make us chargeable with his Sin? Are we charged
 " with the *Sins* of our Representatives, even those of our own
 " choosing? Or are we only liable to suffer by their Miscon-
 " duct? If our Representatives, whom we honestly chuse,
 " should, unbeknown to us, vote to murder a Town, or Fa-
 " mily, should we become thereupon guilty of Murder?"--

MIN. The Consequence is denied without Reason; and the Queries he propounds, are very unadvised, and inconsiderate: for is it not agreeable to the Maxims of all Nations, that whatever Good or Evil is done by the *Representatives* of a Community, in the Capacity of Representatives, is *imputed*, either to the Benefit and Advantage, or to the Damage and Hurt of the whole Community, and every Member of it?---And as to his Instance, I could have told him of certain *Representatives*, who agreed to commit a *Murder*, not of a Family or Town, but of One who was of more Worth than ten Thousand Families or Towns; even the Murder of that *just One*, the *Prince of Life*, (*Act. 3. 15.*) and these were the Jewish *Sankhedrim*, the Priests & Elders, the *Representatives* of the Jewish Nation; who had the chief Hand in prosecuting our blessed Lord unto Death, and the Guilt of whose Sin was *imputed* to the whole Nation and their Posterity, according to that fearful Imprecation (*Matth. 27. 25.*) *His Blood be on us, and on our Children.* Alas! God took them at their Word, and brought this *Blood* upon the whole unbelieving Nation, with a most dreadful Vengeance; they being killed with the most horrid Slaughter; their City and Temple burnt by the *Romans*; and the Remains of 'em dispersed all over the Earth. They did not only *suffer*, by the Misconduct of their *Representatives*; but their *Guilt* was charg'd upon them, according to the Curse imprecated,

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 39

imprecated, *His Blood* (i. e. the Guilt of his Death) *be upon us*, &c. In Consequence hereof, *Wrath came upon them to the uttermost* (1 Thess. 2. 16.) and not only on that unhappy Generation, but (which is well to be observ'd) on their unbelieving *Offspring*, who have been the most wretched People on Earth ever since. God has been *Requiring this righteous and innocent Blood* at their Hands, and has not done reckoning with them to this Day, tho' it is now above Seventeen Hundred Years ago. And the Scripture is clear for *Children's* being charged with the Sin and Guilt of *other Parents*, besides *Adam*, tho' they were not just such *Representatives* as he was.---Further, Christ tells the *Scribes and Pharisees*, that *upon them should come all the righteous Blood, shed upon the Earth, from the Blood of righteous Abel---It shall come* (saith he) *upon this Generation*. (Matth. 23. 35, 36.) Now I would fain know of this Gentleman, when it is said, *All the Righteous Blood shall come upon this Generation*, what is the *Difference* between its *coming upon them*, and its being *imputed to*, or *charged upon them*? If there be no Difference (as I am perswaded, no just Interpretation can be made of the Expression, it's *coming upon them*, but what may without the least Difficulty be suited to the other, it's being *imputed*, or *charged upon them*, the Phrases being *Synonymous*) then, let this Instance alone serve to convince him, that the Sins of Ancestors may be *imputed to*, or *charged on* their Successors, who had actually no more Hand in their Sins, than we had in the Sin of *Adam*.

NEI. I suppose, he will tell you, These *Scribes and Pharisees* were *actually* guilty of the same Sins; for Christ saith to them (Ver. 34.) *Behold, I send unto you Prophets, and wise Men, and Scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, &c.* They *imitated* their Ancestors, in their bloody Disposition and Practice; and therefore were justly liable to be charged with their Guilt.

MIN. And do not Mankind universally from their Birth *imitate* their first Father *Adam*, in lusting after *forbidden Fruit*, i. e. in their Proneness to transgress the Commands of God thro' ungodly Lusts, and so do virtually consent to, and approve of *his Sin*?

NEI.

40 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

NEI. But perhaps he will say, *Adam's Sin* is supposed to be imputed to us *antecedently* to all actual Sins which we commit ; therefore our actual Sins cannot be the Reason of the Imputation of *his Sin* : But these *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were *actually* guilty of Murder, Persecution and Cruelty. And for *that Reason*, the like Sins of their Ancestors were charged upon them.

MIN. Be it so ; yet this Text proves what I alledged it for ; that the Sins of our Representatives, or Progenitors, which we had no hand in, nor did personally commit, any more than the actual Sin of our first Parents, in eating the forbidden Fruit, may be imputed to us, and charged upon us, besides our own personal Sins. For besides the personal Guilt of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, in their Cruelty, and Persecution of Christ, and of his Messengers, Christ tells them, that the Guilt of *all the righteous Blood*, from the Days of *Abel*, should *come upon them* :---An additional Degree of Guilt from the righteous Blood, shed by their *Predecessors*, should be charged upon them, and a proportionable weight of Sufferings inflicted, besides what was due to *their own Crimes*.

NEI. He owns, we may "suffer the ill *Consequences* of "*Adam's Sin* and Folly, but are not chargeable with his "*Sin.*" (P. 8.)

MIN. If he means, by our suffering the ill Consequences of *Adam's Sin* and Folly, our suffering *for* his Sin and Folly (otherwise 'tis hard to conceive, how we can suffer the *Consequences* of it) he does but *say* and *unsay* the same Thing in Terms equivalent, while owning we may suffer *for* the Sin of *Adam*, but not have his Sin *imputed* to, or charged upon us ; his Concession of the former necessarily involves the latter. I may suffer *by*, or *from*, the Sins of another, when they are not *imputed* to me ; yet I cannot be said to suffer *for* the Sins of another, as the meriting Cause, but they must be *imputed*, or charged upon me : Whether they *are justly*, or *unjustly* imputed, is another thing. If I suffer *unjustly* for the Sin of another, then his Sin is *unjustly* imputed to me ; but if I suffer *justly* for the Sin

Sin

Sin of another, his Sin is, in the Nature of the Thing, *justly* imputed to me : And there is no Maxim of Equity in the World but will admit of this, how confident soever this Gentleman is of the Contrary. Suffering inflicted for the Sin of another is in Fact and Reality an *Imputation* of that other's Sin. In like Manner, the Afflictions and Death, which we suffer in *Consequence* of *Adam's* Sin (as this Gentleman affects to speak, in Stead of saying, *for Adam's* Sin) are a real *Imputation* of his Sin to us.

NEI. But I recollect something further ; he declares it “ *impossible*, that *one Man's Sins* should be transferred, or imputed to another. (P. 9.)

MIN. If it be impossible, I confess there's an End of the Dispute. But confident Men's Assertions are not always to be believed, without Examination ; and what *Proof* does he offer, to induce the Belief of his Assertion ?

NEI. “ *Sin* and *Guilt* (he says) so far as he can see, “ are *personal* Things, as much as Knowledge. And he “ can as easily conceive of *one Man's* Knowledge being “ *imputed* to another, as of his Sin's being so.” (*Ibid.*)

MIN. This shews (what is observable from the Tenor of his Conference) that he, either ignorantly, or wilfully, mistakes the true Nature of the Imputation of *Adam's* Guilt to his Posterity. He supposes, that it intends the accounting that *actual* Sin of *Adam*, whereby he violated the first Covenant, to be our *personal* Act ; or that every one of *Adam's* Posterity *actually* and *personally* committed that first Sin of his : otherwise, he could never say, *One Man's Knowledge* may be as well conceiv'd to be *imputed* to another, as *one Man's Sin*. Whereas, no more is intended by this Imputation, than that by the wise and righteous Constitution of God, that first Offence of *Adam*, his Violation of the Covenant with human Nature in him, which was actually and personally committed by our first Parents *only*, is so far reckoned to *Adam's* Posterity (who are reputed to have sinned and fallen in him, as the Head and Principle of the Nature derived to them) as to render them, on the Account thereof,

thereof, liable to the penal Consequences of it. No Man in his right Wits ever held, that the actual Sin of *Adam* was the *personal* Sin of all, or any of his Posterity ; or that God ever accounted it so : And if this Gentleman has such a Notion of the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, which he so warmly opposes, as he seems to have, he fights with a Man of Straw. He may call it an *Impossibility*, if he pleases, that the Act of one Man, considered as a natural Act, should become the Act of another, either by Imputation, or by what else you please, I suppose no Body will contradict him. And it is a little diverting, to observe, with what Vehemence and Earnestness he contests the Point, as if he had a real Antagonist to deal with, when it is nothing more than his own Shadow.----But at last, his Zeal boils up to a vast Excess, when he says (*ibid.*) " It need not startle you, if I say, I think, *Omnipotence itself cannot do it.*" Thus boldly does the proud Reason or vain Thought of a poor fallible Mortal presume to set *Limits* to the Power of his Maker. For, tho' it be true, that what is *absolutely* impossible, no Power can do ; yet *we* are incompetent Judges of what is possible, or impossible with *God*. And it is too great Rashness, to say, God cannot do this, or that, which we find difficult, by our Reason, to comprehend ; unless we *well consider* what we affirm, which, it seems, this Gentleman has not done. For, if he had well considered the Difference between *natural* and *moral* Acts, he would not have said, *One Man's Knowledge may as easily be conceiv'd to be imputed to another, as his Sins*. For tho' my Knowledge cannot be made another Man's Knowledge, yet my *Sins* may be made another Man's ; and another Man's *Sins* may be made mine ; considered, not as *natural Acts*, but in respect of their *Guilt*. An whole *Community* may stand in such a Relation to a *common Law*, that if but *one* of the Members offend against that Law, *his Sin*, in respect of the *Guilt*, shall be charged upon the *whole Community*. To prove this by one scriptural Instance,---in the taking of *Jericho* by the Children of *Israel*, the whole Congregation was laid under a strict Prohibition from meddling with the accursed Thing. *Josh. 6. 18.* And you, in any wise, keep yourselves from the accursed Thing, i. e. the Thing devoted to God, as that City was, and all that was in it. But one *Achan* transgressed

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 43

gressed in taking of the *accursed Thing*: And the sacred Historian charges it upon all Israel. *Chap. 7. 1. But the Children of Israel committed a Trespass in the accursed Thing; for Achan took of the accursed Thing.*

NEI. Perhaps it will be said here, The Historian might mean only *some* Person, or Persons, among the Children of Israel, who committed that Trespass.

MIN. Nay, but it is charged on the *whole* Congregation. Agreeably it follows, *And the Anger of the Lord was kindled* (not against Achan only, but) *against the Children of Israel.* And the Lord himself charges it upon the whole People, saying to *Jeshua*, (Ver. 11.) *ISRAEL hath sinned, and THEY have also transgressed my Covenant, which I commanded them; for THEY have even taken of the accursed Thing.* It was one only, Achan, that committed the Sacrilege; but the Guilt was imputed to the whole Congregation of Israel. *They have stollen,---saith GOD; and the Penalty took hold of the whole Congregation; as is affirm'd, Chap. 22. 20. Did not Achan, the Son of Zerah, commit a Trespass in the accursed Thing; and Wrath fell on all the Congregation of Israel? And that Man perished not alone in his Iniquity.* Now, if Wrath fell upon *all the Congregation of Israel* for the Trespass of one, Achan only, then the Guilt of his Trespass must be imputed to all that Congregation (tho none but Achan had an Hand in the Commission of that Trespass) for nothing but Guilt can be the Cause of Wrath. And divers the like Instances might be added, to the same Purpose. But from hence it sufficiently appears, that this Gentleman was mistaken in his Notion of Imputation; or his Confidence of the Impossibility of the Thing must fall to the Ground.

NEI. The Minister we consulted as our Instructor, as apprehending him better versed in the Scriptures, and in Divinity, insisted so strongly on the *Impossibility* of one Man's Sins being *imputed* to another, and with so much Positiveness, as to put us to Silence; tho I then tho't that he carried the Matter too far: yet since you have produc'd so many Instances from Scripture in Opposition to his Assertion, I am oblig'd to think I was so unfurnish'd with an Answer.

However, as to the next Difficulty he cast in the Way, to shew the Impossibility of the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*, taken from the Manner of the Propagation of the human *Soul*, (which, you have already shewed, is a Question by it self; and does not concern the present Case, which way soever it be resolv'd) I ventur'd to reply, agreeably to what I have read in a certain Author, that "if the *Soul* comes pure out of the Hands of God, yet when it comes into a tainted Body, that defiles it, and so is all corrupt." I would gladly know your Opinion, Sir, Whether there be any Weight in this.

MIN. I observe, that you say, he propos'd this Difficulty, to shew the Impossibility of the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*.--- If *Adam* were the Parent of our *Flesh* only, as it seems, he would have it, where lies the Impossibility of the Imputation of his Sin to us? Might not our Affinity to *Adam*, in regard of the *Flesh* only, be a sufficient Ground of the Possibility of the Imputation of his Sin to us? This has indeed been a Difficulty with some, as to the Conveyance of a corrupt Nature to his Posterity, but no Argument at all of the Impossibility of the Imputation of his Sin to them. But this shews, what has been observ'd before, that his Arguments are indistinctly pointed, sometimes against the one, and sometimes against the other. 'Tis acknowledg'd, that the Propagation of the human *Soul* from *Adam*, is a Question that is attended with considerable Difficulties; and there have been various Opinions about it, both among the Ancients and Moderns: yet it matters not, as to the Case in Hand, how it is resolv'd, as I observ'd to you, so long as we are sure, that according to the Law of Propagation, a Man begets a Man in his own Likeness. And therefore it is a captious Question he puts to his Neighbours; viz. "Is *Adam* the Father of our Spirits? Or only the Father of our *Flesh*?" And he makes them to Answer, "He is only the Father of our *Flesh*," so as to conclude, "that it is the Body without the *Soul*, i. e. the Body only, which we derive from *Adam*." Whereas, it should have been said, that he is eminently (not only) the Father of our *Flesh*; and that Text in *Heb. 12. 9.* warrants no more. As God is eminently the Father of Spirits; yet that denies him not to be the Father and Former of our Bodies too: so our earthly Parents
are

are stiled the Parents or *Fathers of our Flesh*, eminently, because we descend from them by carnal Generation; yet they are not for that Reason to be denied to be the Parents or Progenitors of the whole Man, Body, and Soul. Our whole Nature is derived from *Adam*, according to the Law of Generation settled at first. Every living Child of *Adam* is born, and brought forth into the Light of this World, a living Soul united to Flesh. And 'tis observable, our Saviour lays the Corruption of our Nature on our natural Birth of carnal Parents. *Joh. 3. 6. That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh*, i. e. carnal and corrupt. Now, whatever Disputes there are about the Original of the *Soul*, whether generated or created, it is certainly produced and united to the Body long before the Birth of the Child. And 'tis certainly born, if a living Child, with Soul and Body united: And as such, it is a Subject of natural Corruption derived from *Adam*. Our Sin and Corruption is not propagated from *Adam*, either by the Soul *apart*, or by the Body *apart*, but by the Generation of an human *Person*, consisting of Soul and Body united. For the Soul and the Body *apart*, are incomplete Substences; so are not capable Subjects of the Principle of Sin, or Holiness, but as in their *Union* they constitute an human *Person*. Therefore this Gentleman's Way of arguing is apparently fallacious, when he says, "If neither Soul nor Body are Sinners *before* they come together, 'tis certain their coming together cannot make them so."---But 'tis certain he is mistaken: for until they come together, they cannot be said to be *Children* of *Adam*, or to be in his *Likeness*.---Now, as to your Question concerning the *Soul's* being defiled by it's Union to a tainted Body, I can't admit this to be the primary or immediate Cause of the Corruption or Depravation of the Soul; which I take to be the Privation or Loss of *original Righteousness*, that was infring'd by the first Sin, and even expelled from the human Nature, which was thereupon, in the just Judgment of God, deprived of it: And on this Deprivation ensues all Disorder and Defilement, in the whole Man; as Darkness, on the Abience of Light; or Sickness, on the Privation of Health. Whether this Gentleman is one of the late Deniers and Deriders of *original Righteousness*, I know not; it looks too likely, that he follows his Preceptor
in

46 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

in this, as well as in other Things ; as too many of late have done : But these sanguine Gentlemen must wink hard, to stand against the Light and Conviction of so many plain Texts of Scripture, wherein that which we call *original justice*, or the *Image of God*, in which Man was at first created, consisting in Knowledge, Righteousness, and true Holiness, is clearly and strongly attested ; which may also be evinced by the Light of natural Reason. 'Tis owing to the Loss of this, that there is so much Blindness, Ignorance and Error, in the Things of God ; and such Aversion of the Soul to God, and Things spiritual, which we find abundant Cause to bewail in ourselves and others, to this Day : But I am not led at present to speak of this.----However, what you have mentioned may be admitted, in a *secondary* Respect, to be a Cause of the Depravation of the Soul ; for, tho' it be hard to conceive how Matter should operate on Spirit, or the Body on the Soul, yet such are the Laws of Union between the Body and the Soul, that we find by Experience, what greatly affects the one, has often a very sensible Influence or Effect on the other. Any strong Impression on the Soul, causing Joy, or Grief, or Horror, is felt in the Body, and has a sensible Effect upon it ; and on the other Hand, when the Body is disordered, or enfeebled by Sickness or Pain, the Soul, in way of Sympathy, is put into some Disorder and Commotion thereby. So, 'tis observ'd, natural Corruption usually very much follows the Temperament of the Body ; and tho' all, thro' the Loss of God's Image, are naturally under spiritual Blindness, and an Aversion of the Heart from God, yet some, thro' bodily Constitution, are more viciously inclined than others ; and some to one Vice, some to another ; some more inclined to Anger and Malice ; some to Pride and Haughtiness ; some to Indolence and Idleness ; some to worldly Lusts ; some to Intemperance, Uncleanliness, &c. according to the predominant Temper, and Constitution of their Bodies. So that this Cause of our natural Depravation is not wholly to be excluded.

NEI. Even the Minister himself in his Conference readily conceded, that " If the *Body* be disordered or corrupted, it may lay the *Soul* under some Disadvantages, in respect to it's rational Exercises," (P. 9.)

MIN.

MIN. 'Tis very well, he grants so far, that it may do so : But then, what Reason can he give, that this is not in Fact the Case ? Is it not Self-evident, that the Soul is under very great Disadvantages in respect of it's rational Exercises, and more especially with Regard to Religion ? Which is acknowledged by us all to be the highest Improvement of Reason : For nothing can be more highly reasonable, than that we should be, and do, as God would have us. And yet this is what Mankind are most averse to. *The carnal Mind* (which is in all of us by Nature) is *Enmity against God*. And such as are *in the Flesh* (as we all are, before Regeneration) cannot please God. (Rom. 8. 7, 8.) Nor do they sincerely desire so to do ; and therefore will not exert themselves for that End.----A Disadvantage indeed ! None so great as this ! And this is what I call *Sin* ; because here is, evidently, a Want of Conformity unto, yea, and a Transgression of, the Law of God ; at least in the inner Man. And this *Enmity of the carnal Mind* is exercised and discovered in all actual Sin and Wickedness. Col. 1. 21. *Enemies in your Minds by wicked Works*.----Agreeably to what I have been insisting on, let me produce the Words of the great and celebrated CALVIN, (not indeed with any Hope, by his Authority, to convince such as are in the same Scheme with your Gentleman, who are grown into a Disrelish of every Thing that goes under *his Name*, but) as what, for their Weight and Solidity, deserve some Regard : viz.

“ Such Gifts as it pleased God to bestow on the Nature of
 “ Man, he left them with *Adam* ; and therefore when *Adam*
 “ lost them, after he had received them, he lost them not
 “ only from himself, but from us all. These Gifts (says
 “ he) were not given to one Man alone, but were assigned
 “ to the *whole Nature* of Man. And therefore he having
 “ sinned, the Infection was not only in *Adam*, but in the
 “ *Nature* of Man. From a rotten Root do proceed rotten
 “ Branches, and this Rottenness is propagated together
 “ with the *Nature* from Generation to Generation. For
 “ (as he further adds) the Infection hath not it's Cause in
 “ the Substance of the *Flesh*, or of the *Soul* ; but because it
 “ was so ordained of God, that such Gifts as he had given
 “ to the first Man, Man should both have them, and (if he
 “ lost them, should) lose them, for himself, and his. Rom.

48 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

“ 5. 12. --- *For that all have sinned.* For (says he) altho
 “ *Infants* have not as yet bro't forth the *Fruit* of their own
 “ *Iniquity*, yet they have the *Seed* thereof inclosed within
 “ *them.*” Thus far he. --- And, perhaps it may not be
 amiss to acquaint you, that a certain modern Author, when
 speaking of the *Rationale* of Original Sin, proposes a Question
 to this Effect, viz. “ Whether it may not be thot, that
 “ the *forbidden Fruit* was (tho pleasing to the Eye, yet) of
 “ a *poisonous* Nature? And whether it is not probable, that
 “ the first Man and Woman being *poisoned* by it, therefore
 “ that *Poison* is transmitted and propagated from Genera-
 “ tion to Generation; even as we plainly see, that some
 “ bodily Diseases are *hereditary*, and especially that which
 “ is called the *foul Disease*?” All I shall add upon this, is,
 supposing the Fruit of the forbidden Tree to have been
 mortal *Poison* to our first Parents, what could be more kind
 and Father-like in the blessed God, their Creator, than to
 give them Warning of it, and as it were to fence them a-
 gainst it, by that strict Prohibition and severe Threatning
 in *Gen. 2. 17.* saying to them in Effect, “ It will be your
 certain *Death*, if you take of that *Fruit*?” Now, if after this
 fair Warning they should presume to eat of that *poisonous*
Fruit, whom in all the World could they blame, for the
 deadly Effects of it on them and their Posterity, but *them-*
selves alone? --- Again, I ask, supposing there was *no*
 poisonous Quality at all in the Fruit of that Tree (as we
 have not Reason to think there was) why should *Adam* with
 his Race escape a whit better, upon the wilful Contempt of
 God's Threatning, and the wilful Transgression of his
 Command, than if it had really been the most deadly *Poison*?
 No, “ O *Israel!* (O Man!) *Thou hast destroyed thy self.* Thou
 alone must lie under the Guilt and Blame of thy own Ruin:
 but God and his Throne are blameless and guiltless forever.

NEI. This, I confess, is Matter of great *Humiliation* and
Lamentation to us, and to all Mankind; and we must all
 acknowledge, that herein there is *no Unrighteousness with God.*
 For, whether the human Nature in *Adam* was infected by
 the *Fruit* of the forbidden Tree, as a deadly *natural Poison*,
 or by the *Sin* of our first Parents only, which was a deadly
spiritual Venom, whereby they were spoiled of the Rectitude of
 their

their first Estate, lost their spiritual Health and Vigor, and fell into apparent Disorders of Body and Mind, yet after such fair Warning and strict Prohibition to restrain them, God was under no Obligation from his Justice to hinder the *natural Course* of the Infection, or to stop the Progress of it's malignant Influences; but might righteously suffer it to descend & take Place on all their natural Progeny. Nay, rather Justice *required*, that it should abide as a standing Mark of the divine Displeasure against the first Sin, so long as the Race of Men continues. But may we not humbly inquire, What may be supposed to be the Ends or Reasons for which God would make a Race of intelligent Beings, whose Fate should depend on the Conduct of their first Progenitor?

MIN. Here, my Friend, I think, you must be check'd. It is reasonable to suppose, that infinite Wisdom has vast Reaches, far beyond all our Comprehension, or the Penetration of any finite Intelligences whatever. The Counsels and Ways of the eternal Mind, are indeed unsearchable. *He giveth not Account of any of his Matters.* (Job 33. 14.) 'Tis therefore utterly unbecoming such imperfect Creatures as we are, to expostulate with him about the Reasons of his Works and Dispensations, that lie hid to us. *Who art thou, O Man, that repliest against God? Shall the Thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?* (Rom. 9. 20.) It much more becomes us to be silent, and submissive to the Decrees of supreme Wisdom. Nevertheless, since the Condition of Mankind, fallen into Sin and Misery (not by an antecedent personal Act of their own Wills, but by the actual Sin and Disobedience of their first Progenitor and Representative) is truly compassionate; God has been pleas'd to regard it as such, and therefore has of his own Grace and Mercy provided a Remedy for it in a Redeemer. And this may be one Reason of the Difference God has made between fallen Man, and the fallen Angels, in providing a Redeemer for the former, and leaving the latter to perish without Remedy, (*Heb. 2. 16.*) that the Angels fell every one by his own personal Sin and Rebellion: Whereas, Mankind fell in one common Head and Representative, by his personal Violation of the Covenant with the human

H Nature.

Nature. Hence fallen Man is distinguished, as the Object of the divine Compassions: and to speak according to human Conception, and in human Language, we may suppose that at the same Instant, when God decreed to permit the Fall of *Adam*, and all Mankind in him, he foreordained his own Son to be a second *Adam*, by taking upon him the Nature of Man, that he might be a second Head of Men, and do the Work of a Redeemer by dying for them. And in Consideration of the Redeemer's Death and Sacrifice, whereby he has made full Expiation of Sin, and in Way of Merit taken away the Sin of the World; as the Baptist expresses it (*Joh. 1. 29.*) which can be understood of no other Sin more properly than that of our first Parents in Paradise (which is indeed the Sin of the World, the whole World of Mankind) in Consideration hereof, I say, it has pleased God to grant Mankind, fallen under the Curse, the Favour of a second Trial for their eternal State, upon the Terms of the new Covenant; wherein Life and Death are set before them, at least as to all those to whom this new Covenant is published, that every one might have it left to his own Choice, to stand, or fall, for Eternity. And the Justice of God being fully satisfied for the Sin of Man, in the atoning Sacrifice of the Redeemer, can be no Bar to the Exercise of Grace, and the Expence of those infinite Treasures of Mercy, that are with him to be disposed of, to all such as his Wisdom shall judge the proper Objects of it. And hence we may conceive great Hopes of the Salvation of those of *Adam's* Posterity, who have never been favour'd with a second Trial, nor have sinned after the Similitude of his Transgression, viz. the Infants of Mankind, who depart this Life before the Years of Discretion, especially the Infants of the Christian Church, to whom the Covenant and Seal of it is extended by the Grace of God, which is a more sure Ground of Hope. And so your Gentleman, if he pleases to consider this, may ease himself of his Fears about the eternal Damnation of Infants, and their suffering the Torments of Hell forever, as the Consequence or Effect of the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin.

NEI. But, Sir, he is not satisfied with this; for he said, "Upon their softer Scheme, that Infants are rescu'd by *Christ* from actually suffering Damnation, they are re-
 " sented

“ sented as *deserving* it as soon as born :”---Yea, he went on to say, “ God, even upon this Plan, is represented as taking up the innocent helpless Millions, and *shaking* them a while over that *Habitation of Devils*, just ready to cast them into it, while they know not their right Hand from their left ! But only at length *Christ* comes, and plucks them as Brands out of the Burning.” (P. 28.)

MIN. But let this Gentleman know, that he abuses both God and Man in these vile Insinuations. He says, *They are represented as deserving Damnation as soon as born* : If he means by *Damnation*, their being doom'd to suffer the *Torments of Hell forever*, which the Word of God threatens to the Wicked, and impenitent Unbelievers, this *we* do not affirm; nor I do know of any in the *softer Scheme*, who do so represent it. However, he cannot but see, and know, that Millions of Infants are *condemned to Death*, (for this, he concedes, is the *Judgment to Condemnation*, which is *come upon all Men* by Adam's one Offence, P. 14.) and that they actually suffer Death, which is inflicted on them by the Hand of God, and this often *as soon as born*. And will he say, that God inflicts *Death* on these *helpless Millions* undeservedly ? That is to say, *unjustly* ! Yet this he must say, while he holds them *perfectly innocent*, and not to have sinned in *Adam*. And so he accuses the *Justice* of God, in inflicting Death on *Infants* without any Cause that *deserves* it. And surely, there can be no Cause in *Infants*, deserving of Death, if they be intirely innocent. But we have a greater Reverence for the Justice of God, and believe that he does *not lay upon Men*, no, not upon Infants, *more than is right*, in the Infliction of Death, being consider'd as the polluted guilty Offspring of disobedient condemned Parents. Now, whatever the Effects or Consequences of this *Death* are, which, we see, actually befalls Multitudes of Infants, thro' the righteous Ordination of God (which Consequences we know not, nor have any Right or Warrant to determine what they are) they must have lain under them forever, without Recovery, had not God in his infinite Love and Pity to lapsed perishing Mankind, ordained and sent his Son into the World to redeem and save them ; thro' whose Merits we hope for the Salvation and Recovery of the Millions that

52 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

die in Infancy, from that State of Death in which they must otherwise have lain forever : We hope for this, I say, from the boundless Mercy, and Love of God our Father, in his Son Christ Jesus, which is the Fountain of all the Salvation we can hope for. And that this is the Sentiment of those who maintain what he calls the *softer Scheme*, he might well know. But now what an injurious Construction does he make of this *Scheme* ? and how reproachful to the blessed God, our Father ! As if it represented him a merciless Tyrant, ready to cast Millions of Innocents into the *Habitation of Devils* ; but *Christ comes*, and rescues them out of his Hands !---As irreverently, as untruly !---Were his Millions indeed perfectly *innocent*, they would have been so far from the *Pit of Devils*, that even the *Gates of Death* would never have been opened to them. But thus Men study to bear down and render odious the *Truth* (which they care not to know, and are unable to confute) by malignant and vile Misrepresentations !

NEI. This I observed in his whole Conversation with us, that he endeavoured on all Occasions to give an invidious Turn to the Point he was opposing, that so he might seem more plausibly to argue against it, and run it down ; and this many Times, I thôt, beyond all Reason and Justice, particularly in the Passage you have last considered ; and I am glad you have taken this Notice of it.---But now, Sir, you have gratified me by the Solution of the main Difficulties I had to propose, greatly to my Satisfaction ; I must beg Leave to be a little further troublesome to you, in desiring your Opinion of this Gentleman's Sense of those *Texts of Scripture*, that have been commonly pleaded in Proof of this Doctrine of *Original Sin*, which I thôt he very much wrested from their genuine Meaning.

MIN. And what wonder ? since he tells you (P. 11.)
 “ If it be plainly *impossible* to be true, 'tis in vain to pretend
 “ to prove it by *Scripture*.”---But that *it is plainly impossible to be true*, he should have proved, and not taken for granted : whereas, all his Proofs, that have hitherto appear'd, setting aside the Strength of his Confidence, discover only his own Weakness, and strange Mistakes. We argue, on the other
 Hand,

Hand, more to the *Honour of God*, and *his holy Word*, that if this Doctrine can be plainly proved from *Scripture* (as we are sure it can) then it is not only *possible* to be true, but most *certainly* true, how repugnant soever it seems to our corrupt bias'd Reason.---But this opens to you the Method of these *rational* Gentlemen (as they affect to be esteem'd) in dealing with the *Scriptures* : in Stead of divesting themselves of prejudicate Notions, and going nakedly to the Word of God, humbly to learn his Mind and Will herein, they first propose to scan the Doctrines of supernatural Revelation, by their own weak, fallible, and depraved *Reason* ; and if they cannot be adjusted to that Standard, or if such their Reason shall pronounce them absurd, or impossible, then let the *Scriptures* speak as plainly as possible in attesting their Truth, these shall be tortur'd and forc'd out of their natural Meaning, to speak contrary to the Sense plainly intended by the Holy Ghost. And because *Transubstantiation*, and other such gross Opinions, are palpably absurd, and have not the least Appearance of a Foundation in Scripture, if they dislike any Doctrine, as crossing the proud Conceits of their carnal Reason, and would beget an ill Opinion of it in the Minds of others, it is but to put it into an *ill Name*, to pronounce it absurd as *Transubstantiation*,---and they think they do their Business effectually. But this Course, in Stead of honouring the *Scriptures* (as these Gentlemen pretend) has a Tendency really to debase and vilify them, as it sets up frail human *Reason* above them, as *their* Standard, and the Measure of the Truth of their Testimony, so as not to admit that for Truth, which human *Reason* (under the Darkness, Weakness, Corruption & Prejudice, that have befallen it, in it's present State) shall contradict. However, it is well, the Gentleman by this hint has fore-warned you, what Sort of Exposition of those *Scriptures* you were to expect from *him* ; before nothing but what should be made to square with his preconceived Opinion, how plainly soever they speak against it. No Wonder therefore, you observ'd some Texts of Scripture *wrested* from their true Meaning, in Defence of his Scheme. Nevertheless, I am ready to assist you, by guiding you to the *true* Meaning of those Texts, which he has involv'd in some Perplexity by his sophistical Management. Let me know what Texts you desire the clearing of, in particular.

NEI.

54 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

NEI. I should begin with the Texts in the three first Chapters of *Genesis*, and in *Rom.* 5. where he began ; but that you have already pretty fully and clearly elucidated them, in speaking of the Grounds of the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*. However, there are several Passages, that you have not taken particular Notice of, which may deserve your Remarks.

MIN. What are those?

NEI. He said, that the Threatning (*Gen.* 2. 17.) was “ directed to *Adam* in Person,---before he had Wife or Children, or probably, the least Thôt of either ;” so as to conclude, “ that *Adam* could not understand the Threatning, as extending to Posterity.” (P. 12.)

MIN. How unaccountable is it, that he should say this ! Since God, in the Day of his Formation, when he created Man, *Male and Female*, told him, that he should be *fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the Earth*, in that Benediction, *Gen.* 1. 28. And *Adam* might well know, that his Conduct, as the Head of the human Race, would have a great Influence, either for Good or Evil, on his Posterity ; as was before observed.

NEI. After a large Recital of the *Threatning* that preceded, and the *Sentence* that followed *Adam's Transgression*, he observed, that “ the Word *Death* is not found in the *Sentence*, but---to *Dust shalt thou return* ;” So as to conclude, that only *bodily Death* was threatned ; and that no more is implied in the *Threatning*, than what was express'd in the *Sentence* ; and that “ these Words, *till thou return to the Dust, &c.* do clearly explain, and certainly bound, the Meaning of that *Death*, which was threatned.” Is this your Opinion, Sir ?

MIN. I think, the Contrary to this is demonstrably evident ; that the *Threatning* is more rigorous and severe, and comprehensive of more Evil, than is expressed in the *Sentence* ; and that there are divers Mitigations of the *Threatning*, and Intimations of *Mercy*, intermix'd in the *Doom* pass'd on our first Parents after their Transgression. For,

I. By

1. By the Threatning, they were to *die* in the very Day that they sinned : But in the first Part of the Doom on the Woman,---*In Sorrow shalt thou bring forth Children* (Gen. 3. 16.) there is an Intimation of a Reprieve, that she should live to bear Children, and have a Seed.

2. In the Sentence pass'd on the Man, *Cursed be the Ground for thy Sake ; in Sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the Days of thy Life* (ver. 17.) there is an Intimation, that instead of dying the Day of his Transgression, his Life should be *prolonged* many Days. And the Event shews, it was lengthen'd out to 930 Years. (Gen. 5. 5.) And then,

3. In that other Part of the Sentence, *In the Sweat of thy Face shalt thou eat Bread* (ver. 19.) there is another Alleviation of the Severity of the Threatning. This intimates, that he should not only have his Life prolonged, but enjoy a tolerable *Livelihood*, which is meant by *eating Bread*, tho' with much Sorrow & Toil. For in these Words of the Curse, there is implied (as Dr. Saunderson has well observ'd) a Command, a Promise, and a Curse. (1.) A Command to labour, and take pains to get a Livelihood, with *the Sweat of his Face*.---(2.) A Promise of such a Livelihood, as the Fruit of his Toil and Labour :---*Thou shalt eat Bread*.---(3.) The Curse is, that he must undergo much sore Toil, Affliction, and Sorrow, in his Labour to procure this Livelihood.---Are not here very great Intermixtures of *Mercy*, in all these Parts of the Sentence ? How then can it be said, that the Words of the Sentence *fully explain and bound the Threatning* ? Do they not evidently fall short of the Severity of it, in these Instances ?---And then, (4.) As to the *Death threatned*, which I suppose this Gentleman chiefly intended, we have no Reason to think but that *everlasting Death* is included in the Threatning. And had *Adam* died in the Day that he sinned, what but everlasting Death could have been his Lot, without all Hope of a Return to Life ?---But in the *Doom*, it is limited to the Death of the *Body*, & it's mouldering into Dust in the Grave. And the Reason of this Difference is evident, because, between the Threatning and the Sentence, the *Gospel-Promise* of a Redeemer, the *Seed* of the *Woman*, intervened ; by whose Grace and Merit, all that are related to him, and interested in him, as his spiritual Seed, are delivered from everlasting Death. And as to *them*,
the

56 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

the Death of the Body, and returning to the Dust, *bounds* (it is true) all the Effects of the Curse they were doom'd to, for the first Transgression. And to this promis'd Redeemer are owing all those Mitigations of the Threatning before-mentioned ; and also the Favour of a State of Probation, God hath afforded fallen Mankind, for their eternal State : And those that in this Day of their Trial, refuse the Redeemer, and will not receive this second *Adam*, as their Head and Saviour, must be left to the Rigor of the first *Threatning* ; which will be executed upon them in eternal Death and Damnation, as the Word of the Gospel teaches. If there had been no Redeemer appointed for fallen Man, no Satisfaction to the injured Justice of God for that first Transgression, to make Way for his Mercy to Man, we don't suppose, that *Adam* would have had any Posterity at all ; but that he himself would have been cut off, and perish'd, according to the Rigor of the Threatning, in the very *Day* in which he sinned, even as the sinning Angels were, and that everlastingly.

NEI. But the Minister was positive in it, that *no more* is intended, in these Verses in *Genesis*, than bodily Death, and the temporal Evils that preceed it, either in the Threatning, or in the Sentence.---He says, " he can find nothing " threatned, but *Death*.---Not one Word about any such " *Covenant* made with *Adam*, as is pretended ! Not one " Word about his being such a *Representative*, as that we " should be charged with his Sin ! Nor one Word about " *Damnation* in another World !" (P. 12, 13.)

MIN. Not one Word !---This is the right *Socinian* Way arguing : Not one Word of the Trinity ; not one Word of the Incarnation of the Son of God ; not one Word of the Satisfaction of Christ ; not one Word of Original Sin, in all the Scriptures : therefore these Doctrines are to be discarded, and not to be endured among Christians.---But if these *Words* are not to be found, in so many Syllables, in these Chapters of *Genesis* ; yet I have largely shewed, by the Light that other Parts of sacred Scripture cast upon them, especially *Paul's* Epistles in the New Testament, that the *Things* themselves are evidently to be found there. And if

the Things signified by those Terms and Phrases, necessary to explain the Doctrine of Man's Apostacy, be assented to, we shall no longer contend about Words and Phrases. But it seems, he can find nothing but *Death*, in the Threatning, or the Doom pronounced ; and reckons all others *infatuated* (and blind too) with Prejudice, who can see any thing else. For his Part, he can see *nothing but Death* ! This, as it seems, is but a light Matter with him.--- Indeed I doubt whether he sees so much as *that*, in it's comprehensive Sense : Because, I think, he that sees *Death*, in the full Scripture-Sense of the Word, as it is used in the Threatning, *Thou shalt die*, sees all the Ruin of Mankind, in Body and Soul, to Eternity, in one compendious View. For the Death, God threatned *Adam* with, must be understood to consist in the Privation of *all the Life*, that he enjoyed in Paradise ; which was threefold : *natural*, in the Union of Soul and Body ; *spiritual*, in the Union of his Soul to God, by the holy Image of his Maker stamp'd upon him ; and an *happy Life* in Paradise, which should have been prolong'd to Immortality, had he not sinned, and which was a Type of eternal Life in Heaven. Now *Death*, as it consists in the Privation of these several Kinds of Life, or considered in Opposition to them, God threatned *Adam* with ; that is, with every kind of Death, natural, spiritual, and eternal : and every kind of Death *Adam* incurred by his Transgression. Of *natural* Death there is no Question ; he incurred also a *spiritual* Death, which consists in the Loss of the Divine Image, and in the Dissolution of the Union between God and him, by the Violation of the first Covenant ; and he became liable to *eternal* Death, in being deprived of a blessed Immortality. And the Name of *Death* is commonly given in Scripture to the Privation of these several Kinds of Life ; and is not appropriated to natural Death, but is frequently applied to denote spiritual and eternal Death. (1.) *Spiritual*, in a Separation or *Alienation from the Life of God*. Eph. 4. 18.---*Dead in Trespasses and Sins*. Chap. 2. 1, 5. Col. 2 13.---(2.) *Eternal* Death and Damnation. Rom. 8. 6. *To be carnally minded is Death*. It may connote *spiritual* Death ; but the Apostle principally intends *eternal* Death and Misery, as the Fruit and Issue of a carnal Mind and Life. So, ver. 13. *If ye*

58 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

live after the Flesh, ye shall die, i. e. be eternally damned : For whether they lived after the *Flesh*, or after the *Spirit*, they must die a *bodily* Death. And the Threatning, which so often occurs in Scripture in this kind of Phrase, *Ye shall die*, taken in it's full Latitude, means nothing short of Eternal Damnation. *Ezek. 33. 11.---Why will ye die?* Why will ye perish *eternally*? For as to bodily Death, that is not left to the Choice of our Will.--- Now since there are these several Kinds of Death spoken of in Scripture, what Reason or Warrant had this Gentleman to restrain the Death threatned (in such Terms, as in other Scripture-Threatnings necessarily intend eternal Death and Damnation) to meer bodily Death? Or what Revelation had he to assure him, that this only was meant? It can't be infer'd from the Sentence pronounced after the Transgression; for we have already seen, that there are in that Sentence divers *Mitigations* of the Severity of the Threatning, in Consideration of a promised *Redeemer*. Had there been no such Redeemer provided, and had the Threatning been, consequently, executed on fallen *Adam* in it's full Rigor, there can be no doubt but that, in Virtue thereof, he would have been subject to a State of *eternal Death*. And notwithstanding the Provision of a Redeemer, all that persist in their Refusal of his gracious Proposals, all finally unbelieving and impenitent Sinners are obnoxious to this Threatning, and by Virtue of it, doom'd to *eternal Death*, or subjected to *eternal Damnation*; if not for *Adam's* Sin alone, yet at least for their personal sinning *after the Similitude of Adam's Transgression*. For tho' it be a Question disputed, how far the Law-Covenant is abrogated or superseded by the New-Covenant or Gospel of Christ; yet (as far as I know) all agree, that the impenitent Despisers of the Redeemer's Grace are left to the Rigor of the first broken Covenant and it's Curse, which stands in full Force against them. So that we need not look for "some other Sentence, by which they are "doom'd to eternal Damnation"; tho' the first Law-Threatning is bound upon them, by the Sentence of the Gospel.--- I would have put this Question to the Gentleman, had I been in your Place; Were our first Parents *saved by Faith* in the promised Seed? Or were they not? If they were not saved by Faith in him, or if they did not believe in him

to Salvation, then they must inevitably fall into *eternal Condemnation*, both by the Sentence of the Law, and Gospel ; or (which is the same) must be left under the threatened Penalty of the first Law-Covenant for ever, without all Hope of Relief from the Redeemer's Grace. -- If he grants they were *saved by Faith* in this promised Seed, then I wou'd ask him, *What* were they saved from ? Not from *bodily* Death ; for *this* they were sentenc'd to undergo, notwithstanding a Redeemer promised, and their Interest in him : it remains then, that they could be sav'd only from *spiritual* and *eternal* Death. And if so, then this Death, even eternal Death and Damnation, were included and intended in the first Threatning : otherwise, they had not been subject to it, and had needed no Salvation from it. If it be said, that they are saved at the Resurrection, by the Recovery of their *Bodies* from the Power of Death and the Grave, and their Re-union to their Souls ; what is this but to say, they are saved from *eternal Death* ? For without a Resurrection, their Bodies must be under the Power of Death forever. And as for their *Souls*, if they be not recovered by the Grace of Christ from their *spiritual Death* in Sin, what can be concluded, but that they must abide in a State of *everlasting Damnation* ?

NEI. I think, you have sufficiently clear'd and vindicated the true Sense of the Threatning, and the Doom on our first Parents in *Genesis*, consistently with the Tenor of the holy Scriptures, as I always understood them. And if my two Neighbours, who consulted the Minister with me, had bethought themselves of what you have now suggested, I can scarce think they would so readily have jump'd into his Opinion ; nor should I have been so mute and silent, for want of a Reply to him in this Part of the Conference, if these Things had then occur'd to my Mind. And now I am satisfied, the Gentleman had not thoroughly digested his Scheme, how positive and confident soever he seem'd to be, when he endeavour'd to impose it upon us. Will you please, Sir, to go on and favour me with your Remarks on *Rom. 5* ?

MIN. After so large Quotations and Illustrations of that Chapter, in vindicating the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*, I see
I 2 very

60 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

very little Need of spending Time in animadverting on every minute Reflection of this Gentleman's, however exceptionable. And indeed that one plain Text is fully sufficient and decisive in the present Case; viz. Verse 12. *As by one Man Sin enter'd into the World, and Death by Sin, even so Death has pass'd upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* For if, according to some Translations, it be render'd (as I have already observed) *in whom all have sinned*, it then expressly and positively declares that *all have sinned in one Man*, viz. *Adam*. Or if our Translation be adhered to, the same Thing is necessarily concluded; for it assigns the Reason why *Death has pass'd upon all Men, for that* (or because) *all have sinned*.----But now, it is certain there are Thousands, yea, Millions of Mankind that die, who have never sinned in the least, if not in *Adam*, viz. all that die in *Infancy*. The Whole of what the Gentleman says, to extricate himself from the Difficulties he is pinch'd with, in this, and the following Verses of the Chapter, is meer Quibble. The Force of Truth has compelled him, more than once, to make such *Concessions*, as quite subvert his Scheme, and yield the Point he so warmly opposes. For he fairly concedes, that "this 12th Verse represents us as having *sinned in or by Adam*, in some Sense or other, so as to suffer Death." Now in what Sense can all Mankind be said to have sinned in *Adam*? They must be said to have sinned in him, either *actually*, by committing his Sin; or *seminally*, as being in his Loins, when he sinned; or *representatively*, as being in him their common Head, a public Person representing all his Posterity. The first, no Man will say; that they sinned in *Adam* by the *actual* Commission of his Sin; it being impossible, and ridiculous to imagine: For so they must be said to have sinned in their own Persons, and not in *Adam*.-- In the two other Senses, we affirm, that we all sinned in *Adam*, viz. *seminally*, and *representatively*; and consequently his Sin is imputed to us, respecting the penal Consequences of it, and a sinful depraved Nature from him derived to us. This is the only true and proper Sense, in which we are all characterized as having sinned in the first Man.----Let this Gentleman, or (to use his own Language) *Let any Man in the World that can*, shew us any other reasonable Sense, in which we can possibly

possibly be said to have sinned in *Adam*. Otherwise, let him stand to his *Concession*, and own that the Guilt of that one Man's Sin is so far imputed to all his natural Descendants, as to lay them under Obligation to suffer *Death* on that Account ; and that also they derive from him a Nature tainted with Sin, and therefore subject to Mortality. This is all we contend for ; and this I think is the genuine and unforced Sense of the Words ; otherwise, we can't be said in any true and proper Sense to have *sinned in Adam*.--- Again, he makes a further *Concession*, in what he says upon that Clause in the 18th Verse, *By the Offence of one*, (or by *one Offence*, as in the marginal Reading) *Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation*. For, says he, "to be condemned to die, is certainly a Condemnation ; and when " this is done by a solemn Sentence, or Judgment, it may " very naturally be called a *Judgment to Condemnation*."--- And this, he says, "is what comes by the *Offence of one*."--- It is granted then, (1.) That here is a *Condemnation to Death*, which passes upon all Men, at least bodily Death. (2.) That God does not inflict Death upon all Men by an Act of meer Sovereignty, or arbitrary Will, but by a *righteous* Sentence of Judgment. *It is done* (he says) *by a solemn Sentence*, (I hope he does not mean a solemn Piece of Pageantry, but) by a *just* Sentence of an holy God. (3.) That all Men are thus adjudged to Death, or condemned to die, *for*, or by *Reason of* (the Greek Particle rendered, *by*, is often used *causally*) the first Transgression, or the *one Offence of Adam*.--- Now, what can be more clearly inferred from all this, than that the Guilt of that one Offence of *Adam*, the Penalty whereof was *Death*, is *imputed* to all Mankind ; who are thereby rendered obnoxious to Death, and condemned to suffer the *same* Death that was denounced to *Adam*, for his Transgression ? And hence it follows, that if Death was denounced to *Adam* as the *Penalty* of his Offence, then this Death must come upon all Men as a *Penalty* of the same Offence, they being doom'd to it by the righteous Judgment of God. And this also plainly infers the *Imputation* of his Guilt to his Posterity. For if the Punishment of *Adam's* Sin is devolved on his whole Posterity, this necessarily supposes Guilt, and consequently that they all sinned in *Adam* ; as the 12th Verse declares. *Therefore thro' his Offence, his*
first

62 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

first Breach of Covenant, which all are involv'd in, the *same* *Condemnation*, by the just Sentence of God, comes upon all.

NEI. But he stands upon it, that the *Condemnation* here intended by the Apostle, which comes upon all Men thro' the Offence of one, is only a *Condemnation* to a *literal* *bodily* *Death* (tho' I should think, *eternal* *Death* is as *literally* *Death*, as *bodily*) and not *eternal* *Condemnation*, or *Damnation*, as he calls it.

MIN. It matters little in the present Case, what the *Penalty* is; be that greater or less, he who is guilty of any Crime, that *deserves* it, is *justly* *condemned* to suffer it: And when Men are by a *just* *Sentence* condemned to die, this necessarily supposes them guilty of some Crime, that *deserves* that *Penalty*. For, to condemn Men to *Death* *without* any just Cause deserving it, is plain *Injustice*, and the *greatest* *Injustice*. But far be it, that we should entertain a Thought as if there is or can be such *Unrighteousness* with *GOD*! Therefore the Apostle tells us, that the *Condemnation* which has pass'd upon all Men, is the Effect, not of the sovereign *Power*, but of the righteous *Judgment* of God, on the Account of the common Sin of the human Nature, that *one* *Offence* of their first Progenitor; which is therefore most certainly so far *imputed* by God, to all Mankind descending from him, and represented by him in the first Covenant, as to render them all *justly* obnoxious to the penal Effects of it. Yea, the pronouncing and executing the Sentence of *Death* on Mankind for this first Offence, is a *real* *Imputation* of it unto them. And tho', thro' the Grace and Righteousness of the second *Adam*, all that are brôt into Union with him, are thereby secured against all the evil Effects of this *Condemnation* in a future State, yet to all others it will prove an *eternal* *Condemnation*.----As to the Word, *Damnation*, I know not why he should represent it as more frightful than the Word *Condemnation*. They both intend the same Thing, and both are indifferently used in the Original. And in our English Tongue, 'tis Use only that makes the Difference. He thinks it hard, to suppose
“ Millions of Infants, and others involv'd in one *black* *Doom*
“ of

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 63

“ of *Damnation*, for this *one Offence* ; which at least ”, he says, “ may be justly *executed*.” But he considers not, that upon his own Scheme, at least his own Concession, Millions of Infants, and Millions of others, are certainly involv’d in one *black Doom of Condemnation*, which we all know is justly *executed*, and that for this *one Offence*.

NEI. How shall I understand the opposite Clause, *So by the Righteousness of one the free Gift came upon all Men to Justification of Life* ? The Minister gave us a new Exposition of this, to my Thôt. To prove that the *Judgment to Condemnation* intends only a Condemnation to bodily Death, he told us, that in Opposition thereunto “ the only *Justification unto Life*, which came upon all Men by Christ, is the Resurrection from Death unto Life.” I always understood it of the Gospel-Privilege of the Justification of Believers, not of the Resurrection.

MIN. Were this Exposition granted, it makes nothing against the Doctrine of Imputation, now under Consideration ; for if all Mankind were doom’d only to a bodily Death, and if this is done (as he concedes) by a righteous Sentence or Judgment of God, there must be Guilt lying on all Mankind, to justify this universal Doom ; and what that is, we are expressly told, *viz.* the Guilt of that *one Offence*, or the Offence of one Man, *Adam*. And as for his new Exposition, tho’ some have given that Sense long ago, yet it is rejected by the sounder Expositors, and that for good Reasons, in my Opinion. For, *First*, The Phrase of *Justification unto Life*, is never used in the whole Scripture to signify the Resurrection from the Dead, but constantly in the New Testament, especially in this Epistle to the *Romans*, to signify that spiritual Privilege of Justification, which Believers enjoy in this Life by the Righteousness of Christ. *Secondly*, The Benefits of Christ’s Merit are throughout these several Verses set in *Opposition* to the pernicious Effects of *Adam’s Sin* on all Mankind. But a Resurrection from the Dead is not a beneficial Effect of Christ’s Merits, which is extended to all Mankind, nor is the Resurrection a Benefit to those that are raised to the Judgment of Condemnation ; but rather an Aggravation of
their

64 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

their Misery, in Soul and Body. Christ saith, *Job. 5. 29. They that have done Good, shall come forth to the Resurrection of LIFE; and they that have done Evil, to the Resurrection of DAMNATION.* Therefore the *Justification of Life* is the Privilege of those only, that shall come forth to the *Resurrection of Life*; but the *Resurrection of Damnation*, which perhaps will be the unhappy Lot of the greatest Part, can by no Ways admit this Phrase, *the Justification of Life*, to be applied to it. So that this Effect of Christ's Righteousness does not come upon *all Men*, if it be understood of the Resurrection, as it is the Resurrection of *Life*. In fine, *Thirdly*, The Apostle himself gives us the Sum of his whole Argument, in the concluding Words of this Paragraph; wherein the *free Gift*, that comes upon all, thro' the *Righteousness* of Christ, unto *Justification of Life*, is explain'd to intend that *eternal Life*, which is the Gift of God's free *Grace*, thro' the Righteousness of Jesus Christ. *Verse 21. That as Sin hath reigned unto Death, even so might Grace reign thro' Righteousness unto Life Eternal, by Jesus Christ our Lord.* And this is the Portion and Privilege of true *Believers* only. There is indeed some Difficulty, or Doubt, how this universal Particle, *All*, can be applied to those who share in the free Gift of Justification by the Righteousness of Christ. And there are various Solutions hereof, which I shall not stand to examine. I conceive, this Particle in the latter Clause is to be understood not as absolutely universal, (as it is taken in the former,) but as *indefinite*: So it is often used in the New Testament. *1 Tim. 2. 4. God will have all Men to be saved.* So *Verse 6.* and *Act. 22. 15. Thou shalt be his Witness unto all Men.* So the Meaning may be, that a conditional Offer of this *free Gift* of Justification by Christ, is made to Mankind indefinitely, to all Nations of Men, not to the *Jews* only, but also to the *Gentiles*, as a full Remedy against the evil Effects of *Adam's Apostacy*: And it is actually applied to all that accept the Offer, and receive this Gift by Faith. And so the Limitation in the preceeding Verse, may be well admitted here; viz. *They which receive* (or accept) *the Gift of Righteousness*, i. e. *Believers*: So the Sense runs clear of all Difficulty. *By the Righteousness of One* (i. e. Christ) *the free Gift came upon all* (i. e. *Believers*, such as accept this Gift, the spiritual Seed of Christ) unto
Justification

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 65

Justification of Life ; even as by the Offence of one (i. e. Adam) Judgment came upon all Men (his natural Seed) to Condemnation.

NEL. Notwithstanding the Concessions the Minister has made, whereby (as you have justly observed) he has *given up the Point*, yet he stily maintains the Contrary ; and leaving the literal, flies to a figurative Meaning of those plain Expressions, in *Vers. 12, and 19. For that all have sinned, and many were made Sinners.* Which, he says, “ can only mean, by a common Figure, our being subjected to *Suffering* ; and so, in a Sense, treated as *Sinners*.” (P. 15.) This to me seems pretty harsh and forc’d.

MIN. Therefore, as I observ’d, his Replies to the Difficulties his Scheme is press’d with in this Chapter, are meer *Evasions*. When he had granted, that we all are represented to have “ *sinned in Adam, in some Sense or other,*” who would have thot, but that he intended, in some *true and proper Sense* ? Whereas now he flies off, and will not allow, that we have sinned in him in any *proper Sense* at all ; and betakes himself to a *figurative Meaning*, without the least Reason or Necessity, where the Words (setting aside Men’s prejudicate Opinions) are plain and easy to every common Understanding. ’Tis confess’d, the Scriptures abound with figurative Expressions ; but then the Figure used, is commonly obvious to Persons of any discerning : Nevertheless, when the Words of a Text are in their literal Sense intelligible and plain (as are the Words under Consideration) and there is no Appearance of a Figure in them, then to force them out of their natural Meaning, and make them speak something very different, under Pretence of a figurative Sense, is a strange Sort of Management, which might justly bring any Cause into Suspicion that requires it, and leaves nothing certain in the Word of God. He tells us, that the Words, *all have sinned*, mean no more, by a common Figure, than that they *are subject to Suffering* ; and to be *made Sinners*, means to be *treated as Sinners* : Whereas, there is not a *parallel Figure* in the whole Scripture, to countenance such an Interpretation, which imports a Sense quite different from, yea, opposite to the literal. To have

66 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

sinned, and to be *made Sinners*, speaks the Subject *active* ; but to be *subjected to Suffering* and to be *treated as Sinners*, carries a contrary Sense, and speaks the Subject *passive*. And such an Interpretation makes the inspired Apostle's Argument senseless and ridiculous ; thus, *Death entered into the World by Sin*, i. e. by being subjected to Suffering : So *Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned*, i. e. have been subjected to Suffering. Egregious Nonsense !---So, *Verse 18, 19. Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation*. This speaks God's treating us *as Sinners*, for the *Offence of one* ; and the following Words, *Verse 19. exhibit the Ground of it, For by one Man's Disobedience, many were made Sinners* : This is rational and intelligible. The Apostle here gives the Reason, why God treats us *as Sinners*, in passing *Judgment* upon us to *Condemnation*, viz. *because we were really such, being by one Man's Disobedience made Sinners*. And this Sense vindicates the *Justice* of God, in treating us *as Sinners* : Which can never be vindicated on the opposite Scheme ; which makes the blessed God treat us *as Sinners*, by *condemning us to Death*, when we were in no proper Sense Sinners. And now see how finely this Gentleman makes the Apostle argue in these two Verses : q. d. *By, or for the Offence of one*, we are all *treated as Sinners*, being judged and condemned to die ; *For by one Man's Disobedience, many were treated as Sinners*. A meer Tautology !----This is a true Representation of the Sense he would put on the Words ; and nothing more needs to be said for it's Confutation. He tells us, " It is " one Thing, to make ourselves Sinners ; and another, to " be made so by Another." (P. 15.) It is so indeed ; but what is this to the Purpose ? They are both *really Sinners*, he that is made so, as well as he that makes himself so. *Adam* was made a Sinner, by the Tempter : *Israel* was made to sin, by *Jeroboam*. Were they not therefore really Sinners ? What notable Instruction does this Remark of his afford us ? He would indeed make this a Form of Speaking parallel to that which is used of *Christ*, when he is said to be *made Sin for us* (2 Cor. 5. 21.) and when God is said to *lay upon him the Iniquity of us all*. (Isai. 53. 6.) But there is no Comparison between them. *Christ* is never said in Scripture to be made a Sinner. It is only said of poor sinful Men, that they are *made Sinners*, nor is there any need here

here of having Recourse to a *Figure*, to take off the Harshness of the Phrase ; but in the plain *literal* Sense, it is truly applicable to them. And tho' our Sins were *imputed* to *Christ*, when he enter'd into Obligation to suffer and die as a Sacrifice for them, yet there is a vast Difference between the *Imputation* of our Sins to *Christ*, and of *Adam's* Sin to us. Our Sins were imputed to *Christ* with his own free Consent, by a voluntary Susception, on his Part ; it was purely a voluntary Dispensation, founded on a Covenant or Agreement between God the Father, and the Son, the Redeemer : And therefore the transferring our Sins on *Christ* was not properly an Act of *Justice*, but an Act of *Dominion* and *Sovereignty* in God. And then our *Guilt* was imputed to him, without the least *Infection* of Sin to his holy Nature. When the Apostle saith, *God made him to be Sin for us*, lest we should conceive of any *sinful Defilement* in him on that Account, he adds, in the same Breath, *who knew no Sin*. Whereas, the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin to us is founded on a natural Union to him, from whom also at the same Time we derive a *sinful depraved Nature* ; and therefore this Imputation is truly an Act of *Justice* in God. Hence Judgment is said to come upon all Men to *Condemnation*. So we are in Truth *made Sinners*, by the first Man's *Disobedience*, both in the *imputative*, and the *inherent* Sense : As we are by the *Obedience* of *Christ* *made Righteous*, both imputatively and inherently. --- 1 Cor. 6. 11. *We are sanctified and justified in the Name of Jesus Christ*. --- When *Christ* is said to be *made Sin for us*, the Gentleman asks, (P. 15.) "Is not the Mode of Diction evidently stronger, than when it is said concerning us, that we are *made Sinners* ?" --- I reply, supposing it is, yet the Expressions us'd are as different, and distant from each other in their true meaning, as Heaven and Earth : but I apprehend, he is mistaken, if he thinks there is any strong Figure in the Words, *He made him to be Sin for us*. The Words are borrowed from the Language of the *Levitical Law*, in which the *Hebrew* Word signifies both *Sin* and a *Sacrifice for Sin*, or a *Sin-offering*. Lev. 4. 3. -- *for a Sin-offering*. Hebr. *for Sin*. And in abundance of Places in *Leviticus*, and other Books of the old Testament, where *Sacrifices* are treated of, the Word is used for a *Sin-offering*. And I find it so rendered in the New Testament, Heb. 10. 6. *In Burnt-offerings*

68 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

ings and Sacrifices for Sin. The Word *Sacrifices* is not in the Original. The same Word is applied to Christ, Rom. 8. 3, *God sending his Son, in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, and for Sin, (i. e. for a Sin-offering) condemned &c.* or, according to the marginal Reading, *by a Sacrifice for Sin, he condemned Sin in the Flesh.* So in the Text under Consideration, it is render'd by some of the best Criticks, *He made him to be a Sacrifice for Sin, or a Sin-offering, for us.* According to this Reading, allowing an *Hebraism*, there is nothing figurative in the Words; but the literal is the true Sense. For Christ was truly and properly made an expiatory Sacrifice, or Sin-offering, for us. And tho' the Word *Sin* is also often used for *Punishment* of Sin, as with us the Word, *Evil*, signifies both Sin and Punishment; yet the Text he quotes (*Gen. 20. 9.*) is nothing to the Purpose (nor *Exod. 20. 5.*) For this Sense of the Word can by no Means be admitted here, being utterly inconsistent with the Sense and Scope of the Apostle's Reasoning in this 5th to the *Romans*. So that after all his shuffling, and tampering with the Words, these two Texts (*Verses 12th, & 19th*) remain as two honest, faithful, substantial *Witnesses* to the Truth, of the Imputation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity, and of the Derivation of a sinful depraved mortal Nature from him: *Witnesses*, of an establish'd Credit for many Ages; that it is too late now to go about to corrupt them, or to tamper with them, to bring in a contrary Testimony. But how weak soever his *Premises* be, he proceeds to draw up his *Conclusion*, with great Strength of Confidence, that "nothing more, nor less, is meant" (by the Expressions in the forecited Verses) "than that God so far --- treated us as Sinners, as to Sentence us all to Death." But how groundless, enough has been said to shew; and I leave it to your Consideration.

NEXT. I perceived my two Neighbours not so thoroughly well satisfied with the Minister's Glosses on these Words, as they were with his Interpretation of some other Texts. However, having no Objection ready to make, they submitted to his Opinion: Yet one Difficulty I remember they objected, which I thot would have puzzled any Man to answer; which was, "If it be look'd upon so harsh a Doctrine, to say, Men are expos'd to Damnation for *Adam's Sin*, how is
" their

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 69

“ their being subject to Death on Account of it, to be reconciled to *Justice*? (P.16.)

MIN. This Gentleman, and other Adversaries of this Doctrine, do often upbraid us with the Difficulties and Absurdities, that our Scheme is incumbred with: but the Difficulty you have last mentioned, is such an Incumbrance on *their* Scheme, as, I am confident, they will never be able fairly to get rid of. How did he come off from this Difficulty?

NEL. He answer'd, “ There is doubtless an unspeakable Difference between them. Present *Sufferings*, and *Death* may be made up *hereafter*; but *eternal Sufferings* have no Remedy. (*ibid.*)

MIN. There is, no doubt, a vast Difference between temporal Death, and eternal. But this is a very slighty and insufficient Reply: For *the Wages of Sin is Death*, temporal Death, as well as eternal. And if it be inconsistent with the Justice of God to inflict eternal Death on Infants, because they are innocent, “ as innocent,” he says, “ as can be,” (P.28.) it must be in like Manner inconsistent with divine Justice, to inflict temporal Death on such Innocents, if temporal Death be the *Wages of Sin*: For thō eternal Death be an inconceivably greater Evil, yet temporal Death is a Degree of that Evil, *unmerited* by an innocent Creature; and the putting such an Innocent to Death, no Justice will permit. It is a *Wrong*, thō a slighter Wrong than eternal Death and Misery. And *Justice* forbids doing the *least* Wrong, as well as the greatest: and surely, the most perfect Justice of God will not, cannot, do the least Wrong to any of his Creatures. God hath his Motives within himself for exercising Kindness, and doing Good: but his *Justice* always looks at a Cause in the *Creature*, of the Evils it inflicts; and what Cause can there be in *Infants*, of *Sufferings*, and *Death*, if it be not a guilty State and depraved Nature? His saying, *present Sufferings* and *Death* may be made up *hereafter*, is by no Means satisfactory; 'tis but an Evasion, if not worse: it is as much as to say, God may act inconsistently with Justice *now*, if he makes Amends for it *hereafter*. But is this becoming the Reverence we owe to the Wisdom and Justice of the Supreme Being!

NEL.

70 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

NET. But he added, "The Afflictions of Life, and Horrors of Death, are, no Doubt, of vast Use in the moral World, to check Sinners, increase the Virtue of the Saints, &c.

MIN. If the Case be so, no Thanks to the *First*, but all are owing to the *Second Adam*; who by his Grace and Mediation has corrected the Malignity of the Curse upon Mankind for the first Transgression, so as to be able to bring Good out of Evil, and to turn Curses into Blessings. Otherwise, the Effect of our first Parents Sin, in Stead of being *beneficial* to Mankind, would be found an *Evil*, and *only Evil*, without Mixture of Good; and so it will prove to all them that live and die without an Interest in the Redeemer. Now how disingenuous and ungrateful is it, to apply that for the extenuating and diminishing the malignant Effects of the first Transgression, which ought to be observ'd for magnifying the Grace of God, and the Merits of the Redeemer? As Men that make light of their Diseases, have the less Esteem for the Physician; so those that have slighty Thôts of the Maladies and Miseries consequent on the Fall of *Adam*, are naturally led to have undervaluing Thôts of the great Saviour, the second *Adam*, and his restoring Grace; so whose Mediation and Merits alone, every the least Abatement of the Curse, and all the Alleviations of the Toils and Miseries of the present Life, and all our Hopes of a better, are intirely owing. He is the true *Noah*, of whom it is said (Gen. 5. 29.) *This same shall comfort us concerning our Work and Toil of our Hands, because of the Ground which the Lord hath cursed.*

NET. I am obliged to you, Sir, for these large Illustrations of those seemingly difficult Passages in the *Romans*, which have been so much controverted; and for clearing up the Doctrine of *Original Sin* from them, the Evidences whereof, the Minister we advised with, I plainly perceived, endeavoured all that he could, to involve in Darkness and Perplexity; but now they appear to me in a very satisfying Light.---In the next place, therefore, if I be not over-tedious to you, I would desire your Sentiments, in brief, concerning his Gloss on some *other Texts*, that, as I apprehend, he laboured to pervert from their plain natural Meaning; which I always understood to refer to *Original Sin*, and thôt they

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 71

they had been always so understood by others, both Learned and Unlearned.

MIN. Tho' our Conversation has been already carried out to a greater Length, than I imagine you design'd at your first coming; yet since you are desirous of further Instructions, it shall not be tedious to me to impart them to you, so far as I have Light from the Word of God. Say then, what are the *principal Texts*, you desire my Assistance in any Difficulties you want to have resolv'd.

NEI. They are these, according to the Order in which the Minister reckon'd them up. *Gen. 6. 5. with Chap. 8. 21. Job 14. 4. Psal. 51. 5. & Eph. 2. 3.* There are some others of lesser Note; but these were said to be the principal, and indeed are all that merit our present Attention.

MIN. These are some, and but some, of the principal Texts, produc'd to prove the Depravation of Man's Nature; but if he would make you believe, that these are the whole or main Foundation, the Truth of this Doctrine relies upon, he greatly imposes on you. For the Scripture very much abounds with Testimonies to this Truth; insomuch that I might justly say, --- if this Article of the original Apostacy of Man's Nature be expung'd, and thrown out of the Christian Belief, the whole System of supernatural Revelation must undergo a Revolution. If Man's Nature had come morally whole, and sound, and unblemish'd from Adam, natural Light and Means had then been sufficient to have guided him to his great End: he had not needed supernatural Revelation. However, the Testimonies mention'd are sufficient Proofs of the Point before us: And I shall attempt, in a few Words, to vindicate them from the corrupt Glosses put upon them; wherein that which is most observable, is a Vein of Sophistry, and over-bearing Confidence, running thro' the whole.

NEI. Well, Sir, please to give me your Thoughts on them distinctly, and as briefly as you can.

MIN. I readily comply with your Desire; and will begin with the first mention'd Text ----- GEN.

Gen. 6. 5. *And God saw that the Wickedness of Man was great in the Earth; and every Imagination of the Thoughts of his Heart was only Evil continually.* Add to this the Words spoken after the Flood, Chap. 8. 21. --- *I will not again curse the Ground any more for Man's sake: for the Imagination of Man's Heart is Evil from his Youth.* These Texts the Gentleman passes over very slightly. "Here is nothing (says he) of *Adam*, or *Imputation*." -- But perhaps, upon a Review, more, both of *Adam*, and of *Imputation*, may be found, than he was at first aware of. Consider therefore, This awful Judgment of God upon the old World, in their Destruction by the Flood, was, eminently, the Execution of that Part of the Doom past on our first Progenitor for his Transgression, Gen. 3. 17. *Cursed be the Ground for thy Sake.* Compared with the Words of God after the Flood, Gen. 8. 21. *The Lord said in his Heart, I will not again curse the Ground any more for Man's sake.* Which is explain'd, in the latter Clause, to intend such an universal Destruction as was brought on all Mankind, and on every living Creature, by the Deluge, --- *Neither will I again smite every living thing, as I have done:* Which Words plainly imply, that God had cursed the Ground for *Man's* Sake, (according to the true Purport and principal Intent of that Sentence upon fallen *Adam*, --- *Cursed be the Ground for thy Sake*) by bringing in the Flood; but having smelt a sweet Savour in *Noah's* Sacrifice, which was typical of the great Sacrifice of the Redeemer (for the Sake of which God is pleased to draw out his Long-suffering to the World, from Generation to Generation) he promised, not to curse the Ground any more for *Man's* sake, so as he had done in the Deluge. The Curse was directly pronounc'd on the Ground, but it rebounded on *Man*, who was intended the principal Object of it, as the Men of the Old World found by sad Experience. Hitherto are to be referred the prophetic Words of *Lamech*, concerning his Son *Noah*, which I have before cited, Gen. 5. 29. *This same shall comfort us concerning our Work and Toil of our Hands, because of the Ground which the Lord hath cursed.* --- *Noah* was the Consolation of Mankind, as he preserv'd a Seed for the beginning of a new World, of a new Race of Men; after they had been almost universally extinguish'd by the great Curse, that came upon it in the Flood. 'Tis true, the Ground ever since this Sentence

was pass'd, has been under a *Curse*, in Regard of it's Barrenness, it's unprofitable and noxious Products, and the Toil and hard Labour required to make it yield useful and comfortable Fruits, &c.--- But the Destruction of the World by the Deluge, and of all living Creatures on Earth, was the most *signal* and *eminent Execution* of the Curse upon the Ground. Herein, God would once for all give the World a severe Document of his *Justice*, in the Infliction of the Doom denounced for Man's first Sin, by cutting off his whole Race (*Noah* only and his Household excepted) Men, Women, Children, & Infants, from the Face of the Earth, by that terrible destructive Judgment. And does not this suggest something relative to the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*? --- Again, Observe, that in the first Text the sacred Historian gives the *Reasons* why the holy God was moved to visit Mankind with so awful and severe a Judgment. And the Reasons that justified the severe Execution of this Doom, were (1.) *God saw that the Wickedness of Man was great in the Earth.* This doubtless refers to actual Wickedness; and God might take Occasion from the excessive Wickedness and Corruption of that Age, to inflict the signal Curse upon that Generation. But besides those who were capable of actual Sins, and were personally guilty of this Wickedness, there were Millions of Infants (*Innocents* this Gentleman calls them) who must be involved in this universal Doom. God spared *Nineveh* from threatened Destruction, because *there were in it more than an Hundred and twenty Thousand Persons, that could not discern their right Hand from their left*, Jon. 4. 11. Why then did he not spare the *old World*, in which there were so many Millions of *Infants*, as we suppose? Doubtless, because (as I hinted before) God resolved once for all to give the World a terrible Instance and Proof of his just Severity, in executing that Sentence pass'd upon *Adam*, and his Race, for his first Transgression, *Cursed be the Ground for thy Sake.* Which I have observed to be clearly and strongly implied in the *Promise* God made after the Flood. Chap. 8. 21. *I will no more again curse the Ground for Man's sake.* But how then is the *Justice* of God to be vindicated in dealing so severely with *Infants*, a World of Infants, who had no Share in the Guilt of the actual Wickedness of the Men of that Age? How, I say, but by the following Reason? (2.) God also saw, that

L

every

74 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

every Imagination of the Thoughts of his Heart was only Evil continually. This Reason extends to, and comprehends *Infants*, whose rational Powers, in their first buddings forth, work in *Imaginations*, Figments, Fancies ; the first Motions or Operations of the Heart are signified by this Word. And these are *evil continually* in the Hearts of degenerate Mankind, and therefore from their earliest Age. And this is evident from the Parallel-Text, *Chap. 8. 2. The Imagination of Man's Heart is Evil from his Youth.* The Word *Youth*, in the *Hebrew* Original, tho' it is not limited to the early Age of Infancy, yet includes it. And 'tis applied to an Infant of three Months old, *Exod. 2. 6.* And some of the *Hebrew* Doctors extend it to the *Fœtus* in the Womb ; and the Phrase, *Evil from his Youth*, denotes Continuance of Time, and therefore must take in the earliest Time of Youth, which is *Infancy*. - If it be said, These evil Thoughts and Imaginations are *actual* Sins ; therefore these Texts do not prove *Original* Sin : I answer, Tho' these Texts be not a formal Proof or Description of the Nature of original Sin, yet they teach and prove the original and universal Depravation of Man's Nature from it's *Effects* : As the Cause is proved from the Effect, which has a natural & necessary Connection with it. Therefore this Gentleman mistakes it, when he says, These Texts "do not refer to any thing *Common* to human Nature." Because, tho' the Excess of Wickedness, that reigned in the old World, might be *proper* or peculiar to the Men of that Generation, yet this corrupt Frame of *Heart*, this *evil Imagination*, is universally in all Mankind by Nature. For when it is said, *The Imagination of the Heart of Man*, indefinitely, is *Evil*, this Indefinite is equivalent to this Universal, *The Imagination of the Heart of every Man is evil*, and that *from his Youth* ; from his early Childhood. This was not proper to the Age before the Flood ; for these Words (in *Gen. 8.*) God spake after the Flood, declaring his Purpose and Promise to exercise Forbearance toward the World, and not to bring such a Curse upon it again, *for the Imagination of Man's Heart is evil* &c. q. d. Man's *Heart*, his moral Nature, is the *same* as it was ; not mended by the Flood sent ; nor could be, if a Flood were sent in every Age ; or (as in the marginal reading) *Though the Imagination be evil.* The Gentleman would render it, *Tho' it should be evil from his Youth* ; and thus

thus glosses upon it, "*Tho* he should give up himself to *Wickedness* from his Youth." But the Property of the *Hebrew* Language will not admit this Turn of the Words. This supposes an Uncertainty, or Doubt of the Continuance of the evil *Imagination*.---Not to observe, that he interprets the evil *Imagination* of the *Heart* to intend wicked *Practices*; "*a Man's giving up himself to Wickedness*," or abandoning himself to a Course of Vice & Immorality.---Such loose Interpretations are necessary to support loose Principles. But the Words are, *Tho* (rendering the *Hebrew* Particle Adversatively) *the Imagination of Man's Heart be evil from his Youth*; which speaks the Certainty and Reality of the Existence of this evil *Imagination*. We see then, that the holy God does not look upon *Infants* as quite pure and innocent: This Gentleman often calls them, "*The innocent Millions*"! but the Sentence of God's Word is against him. God has treated a World of *Infants* as *Sinners*, by involving them in the severe Execution of the *Curse* upon the ungodly Old World, and that in Pursuance of the righteous Doom pronounc'd for the Transgression of our first Parents: and God justifies himself in so doing, from the universal Depravation of the *Heart* and Nature of apostate Man.---'Tis scarce worth while to take Notice of that Cavil (P. 17.) That if this Text (*Gen. 6. 5.*) be understood of the Depravity of human Nature, then the Meaning of the following *Ver. 6.* must be, "That the Lord repented he had made Man, because he made him so corrupt and wicked". A Cavil, as groundless, as impious!---It repented the Lord (to speak after the Manner of Men) that he had made Man, so excellent a Creature, endow'd with such noble Powers and Capacities, since he so ungratefully abus'd his Creator's Bounty, and made himself so corrupt and wicked.

NEI. I am well satisfied, Sir, with your Vindication of this Text. Will you please now to go on to another?

MIN. The next Passage cited is, *JOB 14. 4. Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* With the parallel-Text, *Chap. 15. 14. What is Man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a Woman, that he should be righteous?* And *Chap. 25. 4. How can Man be justified with God? or how can he be clean, that is born of a Woman?* Here, the Gentle-

man is very positive, that the true and natural meaning of these Passages is "*this*, and *only* this; Who can expect that any thing should be absolutely perfect, that is born of a Woman? --- Or, Don't we know, that Men are fleshly, frail, *imperfect* Creatures, surrounded in the present State with Temptations, so that Perfection cannot be expected from them?" --- Thus loosely do Men interpret the Scriptures, to evade Conviction from the plain obvious Sense of Words. We have much better Reason to affirm, that the true and natural Meaning of the Words is this only; How can a *clean Offspring* be brought forth from an *unclean Parent*? Or, Who can purify his Heart, which is defiled with Sin from his Birth! --- 'Tis confess'd, that Job here (*Chap. 14.*) pleads the Imbecility & Frailty, the Misery & Mortality of the human Nature (*Ver. 1, 2.*) as Arguments to the divine Pity: yet he acknowledges withal the *moral Defilement* of the human Nature, as the *Cause* of that Misery and Mortality, on the Account whereof he deprecates God's entring into Judgment with him. *Ver. 3, 4.* --- *Dost thou bring me into Judgment with thee?* And he plainly points out the *Original*, both of this Pollution, and Misery, in the Description he gives of the degenerate Offspring of fallen Adam, *Ver. 1. Man that is born of a Woman.* As it is more fully explain'd in that parallel Text, *Chap. 5. 4. How can he be clean, that is born of a Woman?* Man, that is born of a sinful Woman, can't but derive a sinful polluted Nature, even at his Birth, as descended from the first Woman (our Mother *Eve*, who was first in the Transgression) by ordinary Generation. Who could expect a pure and undefiled Offspring from such polluted and depraved Parents? --- Now, let him that gives the other Exposition, produce one Text in the whole Bible, wherein the Words, *Clean* and *Unclean*, as applied to Men, signify *Perfection* and *Imperfection*, (unless he means by these Terms, *moral Perfection*, and *moral Imperfection*, which is the same with *moral Cleanness* and *Uncleanness*, or *Holiness* and *Sin*) and we shall be content to strike out these Texts from the Number of those that are pleaded in Proof of the Doctrine of *Original Sin*. But throughout the whole Scriptures you shall constantly find the Words, *clean* and *unclean*, used (as applied to Men) to signify *holy*, and *unholy*, either morally, or ceremonially so. I remember not

not one Instance to the contrary. When therefore a Man rejects the plain, known, and constant Sense of Words in Scripture, purely to evade the Force of Truth, or defend himself against Conviction, and invents a Sense new and strange, unknown to the sacred Pages, it is an Argument of a desperate Cause.---Nor does he gain anything to his Exposition, by the *Comparison* he supposes there is of Man with heavenly things, in the last recited Passage, Chap. 25. 4, 5. *How can Man be justified with GOD? Or how can he be clean, that is born of a Woman? Behold, even to the Moon, and it shineth not; Yea, the Stars are not pure in his Sight.* For it may fairly be understood thus: The Celestial Luminaries, the *Moon* and *Stars*, which never varied from the Law of their Creation, yet if compared with the divine Purity and Glory, have no Lustre at all; how then shall *Man*, descended from a corrupt degenerate Stock, be accounted righteous and pure before God? Which confirms the Sense I have given of the Words. He observes, that "*Job* uses the Words in the former Passage cited (*Chap. 14.*) as a *Plea*, why God should not enter into Judgment with him." Very well, What does he gather from it? "Tis plain therefore" (says the Gentleman) "he does not speak of the *sinful Corruption* of Nature, which deserved and exposed him to Damnation; but only of his *weak, frail and exposed Condition* in this World."---The Consequence is denied. How does he prove it? "For it would have been an odd Thing indeed, for *Job* to have made use of that, as a *Plea* that God would not enter into Judgment with him, which of itself alone deserved Judgment."---But if they were only *innocent* Frailties he had to complain of, he needed not to fear God's entering into Judgment with him: if *Justice* could espy no *sinful* Defects or Frailties in him, he might safely stand a *Trial* before its Tribunal. Our blessed Saviour, who, as Man, took on him the innocent Infirmities of *human Nature*, was not on that Account obnoxious to Justice. But *Job* was conscious to himself of many sinful Infirmities, which made him dread and deprecate God's dealing with him in strict Justice. And these, 'tis evident, he traces up to his *Birth*. Nor is it so odd a Thing, as the Gentleman imagines, to use *that as a Plea* with God for Pity, *which of it self alone deserved Judgment*. For is he such a Stranger to the Heart of a contrite penitent Sinner,

as not to know, that tho' the Corruptions and sinful Infirmities of Man's Nature, absolutely consider'd, deserve the Judgment of Condemnation, yet in the Mouth of a true Penitent, in his Application to God, 'tis often used as a *Plea*, not to the *Justice*, but to the *Mercy* of God? Yea, this very thing is pleaded by the humble Penitent, in commending himself to the divine Pity; he owns himself justly liable to Condemnation for his Sin; and 'tis implied in this very Thing which *Job* uses this *Plea* for, viz. that *God would not enter into Judgment with him*. Is not this an implicit Acknowledgement of his *Desert* of Condemnation, for his natural Corruption and sinful Frailties of Life; which he must inevitably fall under, if God should proceed to deal with him in strict *Justice*, according to *Law*? It is the same *Plea*, in effect, which *David* makes use of, *Psal.* 143. 2. *Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant; for in thy Sight shall no Man living (no Flesh, as cited by the Apostle, Rom. 3. 20. i. e. no sinful depraved Man) be justified*. He that objects against this as, an *odd Plea*, seems to have no Notion of that Branch of Repentance, which consists in *Self-judging*. But it is what is the usual Practice of the Saints. See *Psal.* 51. 1,---4. And God requires it of all sinful Men, in their penitent Application to him for Mercy, that they should acknowledge the Justice of the first Covenant, whereby they stand condemned in his Sight as Transgressors, before they are allowed to take hold of the Benefit of the New Covenant, which is a Covenant of Mercy and Pardon. The *Psalmist* well understood this, in that penitent Address to God, *Psal.* 130. 3, 4. *If thou, Lord, shouldst mark Iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is Forgiveness with thee, &c.* So that this Objection appears to be but a groundless Cavil. What your Gentleman talks here (as at every Turn) of "every Man breathing justly deserving" to be damned for ever for *Adam's Sin*," I have observed once and again, is out of the Question. But that every Man breathing is subject to *Condemnation* for *Adam's Sin*, even this Opposer acknowledges; whatever the *Penalty* be, which he is condemned to suffer.--- I shall only further observe, that according to his own Sense of these Words, in *Job*, viz. "that Men are *fleshy, frail, imperfect* Creatures,---so that Perfection cannot be expected from them," there must certainly be a *Degeneracy* of the human Nature from its *first Estate*. For to say, that God made Man at first a *frail, imperfect* Creature, such

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 79

such as he is *now*, is manifestly to throw Disparagement on the Wisdom, Holiness, Goodness and Power of the Creator. Surely, God made Man *perfect*, so as he now is not, in Soul and Body. *Solomon* saith, Eccl. 7.29. *God made Man upright, or perfect*; endow'd with all the Perfections of the human Nature, fitting him to serve the End of his Being. Whence then proceeds his present Imperfection and Frailty? Would God cast his beloved Offspring, the Darling in his lower Creation, out of his paternal Providence and Care, and not preserve it in that State of Perfection, in which he at first created it, whilst it continued the inoffensive Object of his Complacency? No; surely it must be owing to a sinful Defection of the human Nature from it's divine Original, in it's common Cause or Principle, under which sinful Defection the whole human Race is born into the World, that all Mankind are become such fleshly, frail, imperfect Creatures,--- that no Perfection, whether natural or moral, can be expected from them.

NEI. Will you now (Sir) go on to another Text, which, the Minister said, "is tho't to be a notable one." (P. 18.) It is that in Psal. 51. 5. *Behold, I was shapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me.*

MIN. This is truly a *notable* Text, as being much to the Purpose of our present Argument; tho' the Gentleman might apply that Epithet in another View --- This Psalm is indeed a *Penitential* one, in which the Royal Psalmist not only confesses and bewails his actual Sin in the Matter of *Uriah*, but also his *Birth-Sin*, in this Text, as plainly as Words can express. And because this is not so commonly taken Notice of by Men, as their actual Sins, he prefixes a Note of Attention to it, *Behold, I was shapen in Iniquity, &c.* --- But here the Gentleman has Recourse (as is usual with him, when the plain, genuine Sense of Words in Scripture run Point-blank against his Scheme) to the "boldest Figures, the strongest Expressions, and poetical Flights;" which, he tells us, the Psalmist uses to "aggravate his Wickedness to the very utmost." But here, he makes him aggravate his Wickedness far beyond the *Truth*, if he was not *conceiv'd and born in Sin*. And would *David*, in this penitent Address to God, while
sorrow.

80 · A Summer-Morning's Conversation,

forrowfully confessing his Sins, bear *false Witness* of himself, and utter before God what he knew was an *Untruth in Fact*? It is a *bold Figure* indeed, that supposes him to do this! Not such another in the whole Scripture! Nor does the other Text he mentions, which he groundlessly supposes to be a *good Comment* on this, at all favour his Sense; *Psal. 58. 3. The Wicked are estranged, from the Womb; they go astray as soon as they are born,* (Hebr. *From the Belly*; so *Ainsworth* translates it, *They go astray from the Belly*) *speaking Lies.* And thus your Gentleman paraphrases the Text under Consideration, “I went astray from thee, even from my earliest Days; as soon as ever I became capable of moral Action; so early, that I may almost say, *as soon as I was born or conceived.*” (P. 19.) This Paraphrase (applying it to the *Wicked*) may be allowed to be “plain and easy enough,” in the *latter Text*; but will by no Means suit the *former*; for there is a very sensible Difference between *going astray from the Womb*, and being *conceived in Sin* in the *Womb*. So that what is said appositely enough of the one, can be no just Comment on the other. Therefore allowing something of an *Hyperbole* in that Text, *Psal. 58. 3.* (as also in that other, which he makes parallel, *Job 31. 18. I have guided her from my Mother's Womb,*) or rather an *Hebraism*, or Form of Speaking in the *Hebrew*, by which what is said to be done *from the Womb*, intends that which is done *naturally*, or *very early*; and in both Senses this *latter Text* is to be understood, the *Wicked are estranged, and go astray, from the Womb*, i. e. *Naturally*, or from their Birth, and also in their very early Age: And if he will adhere to this Sense (the true and genuine) which his own Paraphrase certainly admits, he then yields the Point, before he is aware; for if the *Wicked* go astray *naturally*, or from *their Birth*, or in *their earliest Age*, as soon as ever capable of moral Action, then the *Wicked* are by *Nature*, or from *their Birth*, Sinners, or Wanderers from God and his Law. Yet in the Text, which we are now considering, no such *Figure* can be admitted. The *literal* Sense is easy, and natural; and it requires no Figure of Speech, to render the Words intelligible. The introducing a figurative Meaning into them is without all Necessity, and without all Warrant, or Example in the Word of God. But why, you will ask, should a Figure be admitted in the one Text, and not in the other? I answer, for very

very good Reason : because in that Text, *Psal. 58. 3.* the Expression, *from the Womb*, applied to the *Wicked*, admits a Latitude of Time ; and all Reason requires, it should be understood of their going astray, and *speaking Lies*, as soon as capable, and no sooner. But what *David* here saith of himself, is fix'd to the Time of his being *in the Womb*, or of his Conception and Birth, and admits no such Latitude, as the other does.--- Besides, Words are to be understood according to the Capacity of the Subject spoken of ; and therefore, the *Wicked* being incapable of Speech or moral Action immediately *from the Womb*, something of a figurative Meaning may well be admitted in that Text. But in this penitential Psalm, what *David* confesses of himself, his being *conceived and brought forth in Sin*, he was no ways incapable of ; even in his Conception *in his Mother's Womb*, he was doubtless capable of having that Vitiosity or Depravity propagated and conveyed to him, which hath the Nature of Sin. And this the holy Man confesses, with deep Humiliation before God. Now, this being the Subject in Dispute, when these plain and pertinent Words are produc'd to prove it, for a Man to turn off Conviction, by the Pretence of a *figurative* Meaning, is a Method that will serve to shelter and defend the grandest Heretick, and secure him from ever being convinc'd by the most perspicuous and forceable Expressions, that can be produc'd from sacred Writ. This therefore is but a meer Subterfuge, a vain and groundless Pretext. 'Tis very true, the Psalmist is here *aggravating* his Wickedness (in those Facts of Adultery and Murder he had been guilty of) in various Respects, particularly from the Consideration of the *Seed* of all in his corrupt *Nature*. He seems to stand amazed, to consider what a murderous and adulterous *Nature* he had within him ; which he could not have imagin'd before that corrupt Principle had discover'd it self, by instigating him to the commission of those heinous Sins : but he does not aggravate it by the Acknowledgement of any Fact that was *not true* ; as he must have done, had he been free from the Pollution of his Nature. Such *hyperbolizing* in the Confession of Sin, the Word of God does not require, nor allow ; nor is there any Example of it in Scripture.---As to the *Grammatical* rendring of this Text, 'tis confess'd, there is some Difference among Expositors. The Word, which we

82 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

render, *shapen*, signifies indeed *formed* or *fashioned* : but it also and perhaps more commonly, signifies, *born*, or *brought forth*. Mr. Ainsworth, renders it, *Lo, in Iniquity was I painfully brought forth*. I had rather, indeed, have had it translated, *I was brought forth*, or *born, in Iniquity* : which Signification of the Word often occurs in the Old Testament ; for the Words, *shapen in Iniquity*, have been a little stumbling to some Persons of a serious Mind ; thō, I think, without Cause ; and the forementioned Translation would cut off all Cavil, about his having “no Hand in *shaping himself* ;” and “of it’s being *no Iniquity in him*,” and of “the Blasphemy of charging God with *shaping him in Iniquity*,” and the like. (1st. 19.) But here the Gentleman is much mistaken, when he says, “This *shaping* can be spoken only of the *Body*,”---from a gross Conceit of the Word, *shapen*, which is equivalent to the Words, *formed*, and *fashioned*, and which doubtless refers to his *whole Person*, (*I in Iniquity was shapen*, or *formed*, and not my Body only) or to his *entire Nature*, consisting of Body and Soul. Does not this Gentleman know, that God *formeth the Spirit of Man within him*, and not only forms the Body ? (Zech. 12. 1.) and that he *fashioneth the Hearts of all Men* ? (Psal. 33. 15.) How groundless then, and ridiculous, is that Reflection he makes, from his own Mistake, “What a monstrous Absurdity must it be to talk of *shaping the Body in Sin* ?”---All such Cavils are obviated by the Translation of Ainsworth, and others to the same Effect, *I was brought forth*, or *born, in Iniquity*. But however the Words be understood in their Grammatical Construction, Interpreters generally agree, that the Psalmist by these Expressions intends his *Conception* and *Birth*, or his natural Generation, which he acknowledges was tainted with *Sin*. Nor does he attribute his *Sin*, the *Sin* that cleaved to him in his Conception and Birth, either to his *Maker*, or his *Mother* ; but takes it home to *himself* entirely, and humbles, and abases himself before God in his Confession of it.---All that the Gentleman further objects upon this Text, militates rather against the Doctrine itself, than against this Testimony of the inspired Psalmist alledg’d to prove it ; and it may be reduc’d to this Head, viz. That if Man’s Nature is infected with *Sin* in his first *Formation* and *Conception* in the Womb, and God be the Former of his Nature, then the *Sinfulness* of his Nature is to be charged, not

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 83

not on himself, but on God who formed it ; or, in short, If God be the Author or Former of Man's *Nature*, then supposing it sinful and corrupt, God is the Author of the *Sinfulness* of it. This I touch'd upon before, and I find him often harping on this String ; and this, I apprehend, to be the Ground of his Conclusion, that the Doctrine of Original Sin is *impossible to be true* ; for God cannot be the Author of Sin. But how plausible soever this may appear, and taking with the Vulgar, yet 'tis a meer Amusement ; and can have no Force or Weight, but upon the Minds of weak and injudicious, or prejudiced People. Many Things might be suggested for clearing this Matter ; but I shall only offer one or two Considerations, which are sufficient to shew the Vanity of this Objection.

First, It ought to be consider'd, that the Children of Adam are not the *immediate Workmanship* of God, as our first Parents Adam and Eve were : but are produc'd by virtue of that *original Benediction*, Gen. 1. 28. *Be fruitful and multiply, &c.* and by a divine Concourse with *second Causes*. Tho' God be the Maker of every one of us, yet not *immediately* by the Creation of our Persons, but *mediately* by the Propagation of our Natures from the first Man & Woman, according to the established Law and Course of Nature from the Beginning. So that we may truly say, our *Nature* was not first or originally form'd in our Conception in our *Mother's Womb*, tho' we then began personally to exist ; but it was *immediately* created by God in the *first Parents* of Mankind, and *from them* derived to us in the Course of natural Generation. And in this *mediate Way* doth God still form and fashion us in the Womb, by the Concurrence of his natural Providence.--- God created the Nature of Man at first *Good*, and perfect in all the essential Powers and Capacities of it, endow'd with a moral Rectitude, without the least Flaw or Defect ; which is a requisite Perfection of every reasonable Nature. How the Nature of Man, thus good and perfect as it was the *immediate Workmanship of God*, came to be vitiated and tainted with Sin, has already been declared. Not the blessed God, but *Man* alone was the criminal Cause. By the Breach of the first Covenant, the Union between God and him was dissolved, whereby he lost his original Rectitude, together with his happy State in Para-

dise, both for himself and all his Descendents ; and the holy God, justly provoked at Man's Sin, withdrew his Spirit and Favour, whence ensued all that Disorder and Depravity that has befallen the Soul of Man ever since, and all that Misery, and Mortality he is become subject to in his Body ; the natural Effects of the Loss of God's Image, in which he was at first created. And so according to the Law of *Propagation*, settled at first, whereby like should beget its like (as *Adam begat a Son in his own Likeness*, sinful, corrupt, and mortal like himself) our first Parents could transmit nothing to their Offspring but their own *Self-contracted* Pollution and Depravity, together with their Nature. And this now is the *sole Cause*, into which the Sinfulness and Corruption of Man's Nature, in his first Formation in the Womb, is to be resolv'd ; and not into any Influence from God.

For consider,---

Secondly, The Sinfulness of Man's Nature, which it is infected with in his *Conception and Birth*, is not, nor can be, the Effect of any *positive* Act or Influence of God ; not only because of the *Holiness* of God ; but because of the *Impossibility* of the Thing it self : For Sin being a *Privation* of moral Good, and not a *real positive Effect*, it can have no *positive efficient Cause* ; therefore God cannot be the Author of Sin. Those therefore who charge the Doctrine of Man's natural Corruption with this Consequence, that God being the Author of Man's Nature, in it's corrupt State, is therefore the Author of it's Sinfulness and Corruption, do argue upon a *mistaken Principle* ; they suppose Sin to be a real Thing, that has a *positive* Existence, and requires some *positive* Act as the Cause of it's Existence, which is undoubtedly false. For Sin, as Sin, not being any positive real Thing, we are not to look for a positive efficient Cause of it ; tho' it supposes something positive, as the *Subject* of it, such as the natural Faculties, Powers, and Actions of intelligent Beings ; but *in itself*, it is not any Thing that *positively* exists ; nor yet is it a meer *Negative*, that has no Existence at all, but it is something *privative*, consisting in the Absence or Privation of a moral Rectitude in a Subject, in which it ought to be ; therefore God cannot be chargeable with being the Cause of it, who, as the first Cause, is indeed the Author of all Nature, and of the human Nature, and all it's natural Powers, Capacities, and Acts, and of every
positive

positive *Effect*, but of no *Defect*. But Sin being a Defection, or Declination, a Swerving or Deviation of the Creature from the Law, or Rule it was made to be governed by, or a Privation of moral Good in a Subject capable; it is to be imputed to the *sinning Creature*, as the only blameable Cause. Thus Man may be justly termed the *Deficient*, rather than the *Efficient* Cause of Sin. From these Considerations, it is incontestably evident, that tho' God, as the universal first Cause, co-operates with second Causes in the Production of our Being, and the Formation of our Nature in the Womb; yet the Sin and Vice that adheres thereto in the first Formation of it, hath its Rise from a different Cause, before mention'd; and the Holiness of God is unblemish'd in this Work of his natural Providence; for as God is the *Preserver*, as well as the Creator of Men; and as he sustains their natural Powers and Faculties, in all their Motions and Actions, whether holy or sinful, (for *in him* we all *live, and move, and have our being*, Act. 17. 28.) he animates, actuates, and by the general Influence and Concourse of his Providence, assists our natural Powers, in all their Acts, good or bad, (which being consider'd as *natural Acts*, are *so far good*) without which general Influence and Concourse we could not stir, nor act any Thing, yet he is by no Means to be charg'd with the *Sinfulness* of our Actions. No; he has taught us to charge *our Selves* alone with our Sins, and to acquit him of all Blame; to impute our Sins to the Lusts of our own corrupt Hearts, as the true Cause, and to our Abuse of the Powers and Liberties he has endow'd us with, as the Author of our Nature; to ascribe all *Good* to the *Father of Lights*; and all *Sin* and *Evil* to our selves. (Jam. 1, 13, 14, 15, 17.) Even so, when by the same general Influence of natural Providence he concurs, according to his own Establishment of the Course of Nature at first, with second Causes and Instruments of our Propagation, in forming us in the Womb, he is by no Means to be taxed with being the Cause of the Sinfulness and Vitiosity that adheres to our Nature, derived from sinful Progenitors: the holy and blessed God is as free from all Imputation of Blame in one Case, as in the other. And hence, this Objection against the Doctrine we are upon, appears to be as highly irrational, as it is impious. And I have somewhat enlarged upon it, because it is often repeated
by

by the Gentleman we are now concerned with, who seems to insist on it, as a principal Reason of his Disbelief of the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, and rejecting it, as *absura* and *impossible*, &c.--- Thus I have endeavour'd to clear and vindicate those Passages of the *Old Testament*, that speak very plainly of the Corruption of Man's Nature, from what has been objected against them : And, I hope, not without Success, in giving you Satisfaction.

NEI. I remember a *Distinction* you observed, of the Nature of Man, consider'd as *God's Workmanship* (in which View it is Good and Excellent, and Praise-worthy) and as it is marr'd and corrupted by *Man's Sin* ; in which View the *Blame* of this Corruption is to be imputed to the sinning Creature only : but the *Argument* you last used, is something new to me ; however, it seems very clearly and fully to discharge the blessed God from all Imputation of Blame, in the Propagation of Man's corrupt Nature. I am satisfied, and well pleas'd with your Vindication of those Texts ; the Sense you have given them, makes them look like themselves, and like what they always appear'd to my Understanding. But the *Minister*, in Stead of making hard Things plain, by his bold Figures involv'd plain Sense in Darkness and Perplexity, to my Apprehension ; and I thôt my *two Neighbours* more quick-sighted than I, in that they fell in so readily with his Sentiments ; especially one of them, that yet seem'd less intelligent of the two, who, whether being taken with the Novelty of the Doctrine, or whether out of Complaisance to the Minister (whose Language and Carriage were indeed very insinuating) answer'd roundly, "If no stronger Evidence can be produc'd from Scripture than this, considering the Difficulty of the Doctrine it self, I will readily give up the Point ;"--- thô I thôt he as little understood the Minister's Reasoning as I did. But, Sir, that which most of all surpriz'd me, was, that he told us, "There are no Texts in any of our Saviour's *Discourses*, nor in all the *Gospels*, nor in the *Acts*, which favour this Doctrine of Original Sin." (P. 20.) I always thôt, on the contrary, that some Texts, at least, might be easily found in the *Gospels*, which speak to this Purpose, (thô I could not then call any to Mind) I wonder'd therefore he should say, there were none. I would know your Opinion, Sir, whether the Account he gave us of this Matter be right ?

MIN.

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 87

MIN. He must say it after his Teacher, or he would not follow his Steps so closely as he has done in most things else. But let who will say it, it is a gross Contradiction to the Truth of Christ's Gospel; for I may truly say, that our Saviour has in the strongest Terms asserted the very Thing, unto which we give the Name of *Original Sin*: yea, some of the principal Texts alledg'd usually in Proof of it, are to be found in our Saviour's Discourses, which this Gentleman was so cautious and wise as to overlook, in his pretending to enumerate the Texts of Scripture pleaded in Defence of this Doctrine. To avoid Tedioufness, I shall mention but a Passage or two. One is that in *Mar. 7. 21, 22, 23. From within, out of the Heart of Man, proceed evil Thoughts, Adulteries, Fornications, Murders, Thefts, &c.*

NEI. But these are all *actual* Sins. Does our Saviour here speak any thing of *Original Sin*?

MIN. 'Tis true, these are all *actual* Sins; but they are mention'd by our Saviour as manifest *Proofs* of *Original Sin*, or the Original of all Sin, which is in the corrupt *Mind* and *Heart*, "whence proceed all *actual* Transgressions." For whence should these corrupt Streams issue, but from a polluted Fountain? And do not all these evil Thôts, all the Wickedness in the World, all corrupt Practices, *proceeding from the Heart*, argue that to be extremely corrupt, and as the Prophet speaks, an Heart *desperately wicked*? (*Jer. 17. 9.*) So that you see, our Saviour has here given us a plain Document of the Corruption of Man's Heart, in declaring it to be the fruitful Parent of all evil Thôts, Words & Actions.-- For any to say, that Men have corrupted their own Hearts by indulging their Lusts, or by their *actual* Sins, is to say nothing to the Purpose; for, from whence come these *Lusts*, and these *actual* Sins, originally, but from the *Heart* (which is originally corrupt) as our Saviour here teacheth?

NEI. But you know, Sir, what is commonly reply'd to this; *viz.* If *actual* Sins proceed from a corrupt Heart, and Nature, what corrupt Principle was it that prompted *Adam* to his *actual* Sin of eating the forbidden Fruit? Had he a *corrupt Nature* before his first Transgression?

MIN.

88. *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

MIN. I am aware of it : but the Case is far different. For consider, (1.) We suppose *Adam's* Transgression to be the *first* Sin, and therefore his Nature could not be corrupted by any *foregoing* Sin, nor could there be any *corrupt Principle* in his Heart in a State of *Integrity*. This can't be suppos'd consistent with the Image of God's Holiness and Righteousness, which he stood possess'd of, before his Transgression. Therefore he could not perpetrate that Sin from any corrupt Principle *within*, nor from such carnal Affections and Lusts as are now in the Hearts of degenerate Mankind. But his Motives and Inducements to the Sin were from *without*, from the Devil, and the Woman ; and tho' *perfect* in his Kind, yet being *mutable* (which is the necessary Condition of a Creature, however perfect) and being left (upon his Trial) to the free Choice of his own Will, he was overcome by the Temptation, and prevail'd with to transgress the Law of his Maker. --- But especially consider (2.) The *Matter*, in which *Adam* sinned, was very *different* from that of those *Sins* mention'd *here* by our Saviour. *Adam* sinned against a *positive* Law, in a Matter of *Indifferency*, in itself, neither Good, nor Evil. He was tried by his Creator in a *positive* Command, of abstaining from the Fruit of the *Tree of Knowledge of Good & Evil*. This was not one of those *Precepts written in his Heart*, which carried their own Reasonableness in themselves. The Fruit of this Tree was indifferent ; and in it self considered, there was no more Reason why he should abstain from that Tree, than from any other in the Garden ; but only because the positive Will of the Lawgiver interpos'd in that Prohibition. And therefore this was more fit to be made the *Test* of his Obedience, than any Precept of the moral Law ; which, by the Principles of Integrity in his reasonable Nature, he was inclin'd of his own Accord, and predominantly inclin'd, to observe. Had his Obedience been tried by any moral Precept of the Decalogue, or of the Law of Nature ; such as, *Thou shalt worship no other God* ; *Thou shalt not Blaspheme* ; *Thou shalt not Lie*, &c. his Observance of any of these had not been so fit a Proof of his absolute Subjection to the sovereign Will of his Creator ; because in this Case the Reason of his Obedience might be taken from the Nature of the Duties requir'd, and of the Sins forbidden, rather than from the Will of the Lawgiver.

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 89

Lawgiver.---Nor could his Will be said to be *indifferent* to the Matter of these Commands ; having in his holy Nature an Aversion, and (as I may say) Antipathy to the Evils forbidden in them. Therefore the Wisdom of God appeared in making Trial of *Adam's* Obedience by a *positive* Law, to the Matter of which his Will had a perfect Indifference ; and his Obedience to it could have it's Rise from no other Reason, or Consideration, but the Will and Authority of his Sovereign. Hence therefore it must be supposed, that *Adam's* actual Transgression could not proceed from the Motion of any corrupt Principle *within*, but purely from the Influence and Force of Temptation *without* him. Whereas, the Sins here mention'd by our Saviour, are every one of them Sins against the *moral* Law, in their own *Nature* evil, and contrary to the Dictates of uncorrupted *Reason*. It must therefore argue the *Heart* to be exceedingly corrupt, that this is represented as the *Fountain*, whence such foul Streams of Immorality and Vice flow so freely : and (which is well to be observed) the very *first* Transgressions of the Children of *Adam* are against *moral* Commands, *before* they are capable of being tried by *positive* Precepts ; and therefore can proceed from nothing but a depraved *Nature*. --- And thus you see a plain *Difference* between the first actual Sin of *Adam*, and the Sins here enumerated, as to the *Matter* of them ; and that the latter must needs proceed from a corrupt Principle in the *Heart* ; but not so the former.

NEXT. I plainly perceive the Difference : and now am fully convinc'd, that those Words of our Saviour are very properly and pertinently alledg'd as a manifest Proof of the Corruption of Man's Heart and Nature. And hereby you have also taught me how to understand those Passages of Scripture, that speak of the Apostacy and Corruption of Mankind in general, with Regard to actual Wickedness, as Evidences of Man's natural Corruption ; as in the *First* and *Third* Chapters of the *Romans*, and elsewhere in Scripture ; and how to answer the Objection, That these Instances do no more argue the Corruption of Man's Nature, than the first actual Sin of *Adam* was an Argument of his natural Corruption : for the Difference is very plain and visible, as you have open'd it. Now, be pleased to tell me what is

N

that

90 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

that other Text in our Saviour's Discourse, which you said was one of the principal Proofs of Original Sin.

MIN. It is in our Saviour's Discourse with *Nicodemus*, in the *Third* Chapter of the *Gospel* of *John*, about the Necessity of Regeneration. *Ver. 3.* He saith, *Except a Man be born again,* (*Ver. 5. born of the Spirit*) *he cannot see* (*Ver. 5. cannot enter into*) *the Kingdom of God.* The Reason of that Necessity he adds in those Words, *Ver. 6. That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh : That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.* This one Text fully proves the Doctrine before us, as it shews, we derive *That* from our natural Birth, which renders us incapable of the *Kingdom of God*, without a *regenerating* Change ; and what can *that* be, but a corrupt degenerate *Nature* ? which is the constant Meaning of the Word, *Flesh*, in the New Testament, as it is oppos'd to *Grace*, or the *Spirit*. 'Tis granted, that *Flesh* is a Term often used in Scripture to denominate *Mankind* ; as in *Gen. 6. 12. All Flesh had corrupted his Way.* *Psal. 65. 2. Unto Thee shall all Flesh come :* and in many other Places. But then it speaks Man to be a sinful, frail, corrupt, mortal Creature. Hence this Character is given him, plainly, as a Testimony of his Degeneracy. *Gen. 3. 6. My Spirit shall not always strive with Man, for that he is Flesh.*---Or if we understand it to intend merely the human Nature, this Sense can by no Means be admitted in the Text before us : for it can be no Reason of the Necessity of any one's Regeneration, that he is a Partaker of human Nature ; and it would make our Saviour speak impertinently, or to no Purpose at all, in saying, *That which is born of the Flesh,* hath the human Nature ; for so hath that which is born of the Spirit. But it means the human Nature corrupted, or the Corruption of it ; and this is a good and strong Reason of the Necessity of being *born again.* And whenever the *Flesh* is distinguish'd from, or put in Opposition to the Spirit, it signifies the Corruption of Man's Nature. As in *Gal. 5. 17. The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit.* *Rom. 8. 1. Who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit.* *Ver. 5. They that are after the Flesh, do mind the Things of the Flesh : but they that are after the Spirit, the Things of the Spirit.* So frequently in other Places. And *Ver. 8. They that are in the Flesh, cannot please God,* i. e. They that are under the reigning Influence

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. 91

ence of the corrupt Principle, or Carnality of Nature. And our Sayiour here plainly tells us, that this corrupt Principle, every one that is *born of a Woman*, derives from his natural Birth. *That which is born of the Flesh* (of carnal, corrupt Parent) is *Flesh*, i. e. carnal, and corrupt, the Abstract being put for the Concrete; as in the opposite Clause, *That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*, i. e. Spiritual, brought under the Influence of the spiritual Principle. So that if this Text be interpreted according to the usual Dialect of sacred Scripture, there is none that doth more plainly and emphatically declare the original Corruption of human Nature.

NEI. This, I confess, seems to be a plain Evidence: And I know not how it can possibly be evaded by any fair Means. But how strange is it, that the Minister, when he undertook to consider and examine the *principal* Places of Scripture, that are brought to support this Doctrine, should overlook *this*, which might reasonably be numbered among them, if it be not the very principal of all? And stranger still, that he should assert, "There are no Texts in any of our Saviour's Discourses, nor in all the Gospels, that can be produc'd in Favour of this Doctrine" !---He had not, I am persuaded, thoroughly considered the Matter; otherwise he might have abated something of his Confidence. But there are two Passages in the *Epistles*, which he has taken some Notice of: the former (*viz.* 1 Cor. 15, 21, 22.) has been already consider'd. I shall only desire your Remarks on what he says on the other, which is that Text in *Eph.* 2. 3.---*And were by Nature the Children of Wrath, even as others.*

MIN. The most of what he says upon this Passage, is rather level'd against the *Doctrine* itself, which it is brôt to prove, than design'd to give the Sense of the Text. In giving the Sense of a Text in Scripture, which is pleaded in Proof of any Doctrine, the first Question ought not be, Whether our Reason can account for the *Doctrine* itself, or for all the Difficulties that attend it? But whether it be a *Scripture-Doctrine*? Yet that preposterous Method is what this Gentleman seems to go into; representing the imagin'd Absurdities of the Doctrine, which this Text is brôt to support, "That our Natures come from God," and that "it

92 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

"is contrary to all his Perfections, to say, that he gives us---
 "a Nature which is odious to him, and exposed to Dam-
 "nation, before we have abus'd it, &c." And that "we our
 "selves were not the Authors of our Natures---consequent-
 "ly, can't possibly be in the least faulty---on Account there-
 "of; but as innocent as the Child unborn." ('Tis true,
 whilst we were in the Womb, we were as innocent as the
Child unborn: But he has not prov'd, that the *Child unborn*
 is so pure and innocent, as he pretends.) And then he goes
 on in a declamatory Stile (for his Talent lies in declaiming,
 rather than in arguing) "To suppose the divine Wrath and
 "Fury to rise against you for this---is so shocking and
 "monstrous, that it seems impossible," &c.---All these bold
 and confident Expressions, so far as they carry any Matter
 of Argument or Objection in them, have been already con-
 sidered and refuted, more than once, especially in clearing
 the Text in *Psal.* 51. 5.---But having determined the
 Doctrine he disputes against, to be *absurd, shocking, impossible,*
 &c. weighing his Conclusion in the Scale of human *Reason*
 (tho' it be found too light in the Balance of the Sanctuary)
 if the Sentence of God's Word in this plain Text be con-
 trary to that, it must be forc'd out of it's natural Meaning,
 into some other Sense, more agreeable to his preconceived
 Opinion; tho' that other Sense be really *Nonsense*, as it is
 most certainly here, according to this Gentleman's Expo-
 sition.---The Words, as they stand in Connection with the
 Context, are very plain and easy to be understood. The
 Apostle, to magnify the Grace of God in bringing the *Ephe-*
sians, who were *Gentiles*, into a State of Salvation thro' Christ,
 sets before them the Sinfulness & Misery of their former un-
 converted State. -- *Ver. 1, 2. And you hath he quickned, who were*
dead in Trespasses and Sins, wherein in Time past ye walked accor-
ding to the Course of this World, &c.---*Ver. 3. He changes the*
Person, and saith, Among whom also WE all had our Conversa-
tion in Times past, in the Lusts of the Flesh, fulfilling the Desires of
the Flesh, and of the Mind (a Description of an unregenerate
 State, whether in a Course of gross Wickedness, or in a more
 refined fleshly Life) then he adds, *and were by Nature Children*
of Wrath, even as others. q.d. Not only *YOU* who are *Gentiles*,
 but *WE* who are *Jews*, were, in our former unconverted
 State, under the Dominion of *fleshly Lusts*, in our Conversa-
 tion

tion and Practice ; and besides, *we were by Nature alike Children of Wrath* (worthy of, and subject to the Wrath of God, being sinful and corrupt) *even as others*. Here the Apostle is saying much the same thing as in *Rom. 3. 9.*---*Are we better than they ? No, in no wise ; for we have proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under Sin.*---Now as to the Phrase, *Children of Wrath by Nature*, the usual Signification of the Words, *by Nature*, in the New Testament, is as much as to say, *by Birth, or natural Generation*. So, *Gal. 2. 15.* *We who were Jews by Nature*, i. e. by natural Birth, or Descent of Jewish Parents. So the Gentiles are described, *Rom. 2. 27.* *The Uncircumcision which is by Nature*, i. e. by natural Generation, or by being born or descended of uncircumcised Parents.---So, *Ver. 14.* *The Gentiles do by Nature the Things contained in the Law*, i. e. by the Dictates of the Law of Nature, that reasonable Nature they brôt with them into the World.---According to this ordinary Use of the Word in Scripture, as well as in common Speech, we are warranted and obliged to understand the same Word in the Text before us, in this Sense, and no other ; viz. *We were by Nature* (i. e. by Birth, or natural Generation, being descended of sinful degenerate Parents, and as such being corrupt and depraved) *Children of Wrath*, i. e. obnoxious to divine Wrath. Now see the strange Turn this Gentleman gives these Words, to evade this plain Evidence. He first sets a mighty Remark on this Clause, *even as others*, (P. 21.) as if he had found out a secret Key, to unlock the Meaning of the Words ; but it comes out at last to be no other than what every one knew before, viz. “ The World in general.” This we grant, and therefore say, that the Apostle’s plain Meaning is this, That we all, both *Jews and Gentiles*, who are brôt into so happy a State by Regeneration, and Faith in Christ, were yet equally with the rest of the carnal and heathen World, *naturally depraved*, and liable to God’s Wrath by natural Generation or Descent from apostate *Adam*. Even we *Jews*, who were favoured with the Covenants and Promises of divine Revelation, as well as you *Gentiles*, who were Aliens and Strangers from the Covenants of Promise (*Ver. 12.*) and we, both *Jews and Gentiles*, equally with *others*, or *the World in general*, were Children of Wrath.---And then this Gentleman proceeds to give us the Result of his Reasonings

94 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

sonings upon the Text, in the following Words, viz. "Upon the whole, we may be pretty sure, that when the Apostle says, *and were by Nature Children of Wrath even as others*, 'tis as if he had said, 'And by this long Course of Wickedness in our heathen State, had so corrupted our Natures, as that we were become fit Objects, not of Mercy, but of the Wrath and Vengeance of God, as others---continue yet to be.'" (P. 22.)---So that to be *Children of Wrath by Nature*, is to corrupt their Natures by a long Course of Wickedness, so as to become fit Objects of divine Wrath!---And all this, because "it cannot mean what is necessary to support this Doctrine" of Original Sin: Which is as much as to say, The plain Meaning of these Words of the inspired Writer cannot be true. Thus it sometimes happens, that those who set their Wits on Work to pervert the Scripture, in favour of Error, are left, in the just Judgment of God, to befool themselves, and shew a perverted Judgment. For what but a perverted Judgment could ever interpret *our being Children of Wrath by Nature*, to intend "our corrupting our Natures by a long Course of Sensuality and Wickedness"? Whereas, the Apostle makes a plain Distinction between their *Conversation in the Lusts and Works of the Flesh*, and what they *were by Nature*. Yet this Gentleman has the Confidence, to appeal to all Men, whether those who so corrupted their Natures by wicked Customs, "may not justly and strictly, properly and naturally, be said to be *by Nature Children of Wrath*." (P. 21.) He must have a mean Opinion of the Judgment and Sense of Mankind, to imagine they will all subscribe to his Sentiment, or to think they will all be as complaisant as some of his Neighbours. It was well he had the Answer of his two Neighbours under his Direction; otherwise they might have replied, "Sir, you impose upon common Sense; we can never be persuaded to believe, that our being *Children of Wrath by Nature*, means our corrupting our Nature by wicked Practices, and so becoming Children of Wrath. When we say, a Man is proud by Nature, passionate by Nature, covetous, envious, or contentious by Nature, we mean something interwoven in his Temper and Constitution, something he brôt with him from his Birth into the World, and bred in the Bone (as the Expression is) and not any thing acquired by long Custom, or Practice."

Practice."---Besides (not to take Notice of his Blunder in reckoning the Apostle among the *Gentiles*, in making him say to the *Ephesians*, "By this long Course of Wickedness in *our* heathen State, we had so corrupted *our* Natures," &c. as if *Paul* was bred an Heathen ! I would only ask ; Was *Paul* one of those that by a long Course of Sensuality and Wickedness had corrupted their Natures ? who tells us of himself, that as touching the Righteousness in the Law he was blameless, before his Conversion to the Faith of Christ. Or, had *Timothy* thus corrupted his Nature ? (Who is noted for Piety from his Childhood, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15.) And other devout *Jews* and *Profelytes*, who embraced the Christian Faith ; had all these corrupted their Natures by wicked Habits ? This cannot with Reason be affirmed ; for thô they all had their Conversation in Times past (i. e. before their Conversion) in the Lusts of the *Flesh*, &c. (as the Apostle testifies) yet this does not always necessarily imply a Course of Sensuality and gross Wickedness, but may be verified of a more refined Way of serving the *Flesh*. Yet here he includes himself, and others, in the same Censure, how blameless soever in their external Deportment they had been from their Youth. *WE ALL* (saith he) *had our Conversation in the Lusts of the Flesh, &c. and (we all) were by Nature Children of Wrath.*---Which was true of them all, as having brôt *That* with them into the World from their Birth, which rendered them Objects of the divine Displeasure, even a sinful depraved *Nature*, derived from fallen *Adam*.---But what has been said, is enough to expose that incongruous and ill-contrived Exposition. It remains then a Truth, and a lamentable and affecting Truth it is (however loth Men are to own it) that whatever Difference the Grace of God (common or special) makes among the Children of Men, whatever good natural Temper some are of, whatever pious Education they have had, whatever morally blameless Lives they have led ; yea, whatever sanctifying Grace any have been endowed with, they are all equally with others, by natural Generation and Birth, in a State of Defection from original Righteousness ; they all bring with them into the World a *Nature* infected with Sin, alienated from, and averse to God and Holiness, favouring only the Things of the *Flesh* ; and therefore expos'd to divine *Wrath*.

NET. But there is one *Objection*, Sir, which you have not answer'd, *viz.* That if all are by *Nature* (i.e. by natural Descent from a corrupt Stock) *Children of Wrath*, and if this intends their Obnoxiousness to *eternal Damnation*, then all the Children of Men, in the State wherein they are born into the World, even those that die from the Birth, are *liable to eternal Damnation*. And 'tis this, I perceive, that gives the chief Disgust to this Gentleman against the common Exposition of the Text; for, says he (P. 21.) "We can't yet find, that any are, or ever were, by *Nature*, strictly and literally taken, *Children of Wrath*, if this means Heirs of *Damnation*," i. e. eternal Damnation, as he often speaks.

MIN. It is certain, if we believe the Gospel, that all such of the Children of Men, as depart this Life in a *natural State*, that is, without a saving Interest in the Redeemer's Merits; are *liable to the Wrath of God*, as that imports *eternal Damnation*.---As to the Case of *Infants, Idiots*, and others, that depart this Life, before they are arrived to the Use of Reason, and are capable of a State of Trial, I have once and again intimated my Thôts to you, that it is safest to leave them in the Hands of a merciful God; whose Dealings with such in a future State are among those *secret and unrevealed Things of God*, which belong not to us to know, nor ought we to covet to be *wise above what is written*. A modest Confession of our own Ignorance much better becomes us, than bold and peremptory Determinations concerning either their Salvation, or Damnation. Whatever *Hopes* we may conceive of the Salvation of the *Infant-Children* of Mankind in *general*, dying from the Womb before the Commission of actual Sins, (which I rather incline to, since the Government of the World and of Mankind is put into the Hand of the Mediator, and the Apostle puts *much more* into the Grace and Merit of Christ to save, than was in the Sin of *Adam* to condemn and destroy) yet we have no Ground for any *positive Conclusion*. However, as to the Infant-Offspring of *Christian Parents*, who are in Covenant with God, and to whom belongs God's Promise to *Abraham*, to be a *God* to them and to their *Seed*, there is no room to doubt, but when they die, their Souls are received to the Society of the Spirits in *Paradise*; who may be, as soon as born, translated out of a
State

State of corrupt Nature by the regenerating Grace & Mercy of God, in Christ, into a State of Salvation.

NEI. How then can they be said to be *by Nature the Children of Wrath*?

MIN. Very justly, on Account of the Sin and Pollution that cleaves to their *Nature*, which is displeasing to God: *Wrath*, being figuratively applied to GOD, signifies his *Justice* in punishing Sin, and sometimes the *Effects* of it in the Punishment inflicted; and so the Idea of *Eternity* is not necessarily connected with *Wrath*, nor does it always signify *eternal Damnation*; but very often, in Scripture, *temporal* Judgments: as when it is said, *Wrath fell on all the Congregation of Israel*, for *Achan's* Trespas, (*Josh. 22. 20.*) who will say, it here means *eternal Wrath*? So *Infants*, who are saved from all Punishment in a future State, may yet properly be said to be *Children of Wrath*, as *Wrath* signifies the Justice of God inflicting Punishment, which they are subject unto, in temporal Sufferings, and Death; left, even on *Infants*, as a Mark or Token of his holy *Wrath* against the *first Sin*, which (as has been observed) is the Sin of the whole human Nature.

NEI. I can't object against the Explication you give of these Words, and therefore I can't but readily agree to the more favourable Opinion of the State of *Infants* after their Death. I have check'd my self for the too harsh Censure I pass'd upon them heretofore, being led into it chiefly by the Words of this Text, not so well understood by me; but now I drop it entirely, conceiving from what you have suggested, it is enough to denominate them *Children of Wrath*, that they are born of Parents in a State of Apostacy from God, the Objects of his Displeasure, subject to temporal Evils and Death. This seems sufficient to intitle them to that Character, without going further. These temporal Sufferings and Death, befalling *Infants*, are indeed a manifest and very awful Token of God's *Wrath*, or Displeasure, against the Sin and Corruption of the *human Nature*. Yet nothing forbids, but that they may be taken under the gracious Patronage of the second *Adam*, be made Partakers of his redeem-

O

ing

ing Mercy, and so be received up to Glory, as soon as they have undergone a Dissolution, according to the Doom pronounc'd for the first *Adam's* Transgression, in *returning to the Ground*.--- I hold this Text to be a clear and strong Proof of the *hereditary* Pollution of Man's *Nature*.---But the *Minister's* Exposition of this, as well as of the foregoing Texts, seem'd so harsh, and strain'd to serve his Purpose, that I could not at all relish it as genuine; and plainly told him, "he was putting a *new* Sense upon the Scriptures, and *perverting* them; and that the Doctrine in Dispute had been the Doctrine of the Church in all Ages, ever since the *Apostles* Days." But to my Surprise, he *denied*, this was Fact; telling us, This Doctrine was of a much *later* Date than the *Apostles* Time by 3 or 4 Hundred Years; and to that Purpose, gave us a pretty long Account of the Antiquity of this Doctrine. I should be glad (Sir) you would favour me with your Remarks upon the Account he has given in his printed Conference, that I might know what to judge of it. For tho' it appears to be a Doctrine well founded on *Scripture*, yet it may be a great Prejudice to it's Entertainment and Belief, if this be true, that it was never receiv'd in the *ancient Church*, immediately succeeding the *Apostles*.

MIN. You were doubtless in the right, in saying, "This has been the Doctrine of the Church in all Ages, ever since the *Apostles* Days." And you might have said, in all Ages *before* the *Apostles* Days. It was the Belief of the Church in the *Patriarchal* Age; as we learn from the Book of *Job*. And that it was a Doctrine receiv'd in the *Old-Testament Church*, we have sufficient Evidence from the Writings of *Moses*, and the *Prophets*, and the *Psalms*. And we have good Reason to persuade us, that it was the Belief of the ancient *Jews* in our Saviour's Time. Mr. *Ainsworth* (on *Gen. 8. 21.*) quotes *Beresith Rabba* (an *Hebrew* Commentary on the Place) wherein a Rabbi is said to be ask'd, *When is the evil Imagination put into Man?* And he answer'd, *From the Hour that he is formed.* And Dr. *Lightfoot* represents it as the general Belief of the *Jewish Nation*; & some of them, according to the Report of that Author, went further, and held that an *Infant* may be guilty of *actual* Sins, or of some irregular Actings, even in it's Mother's Womb;† which

was

† *Lightfoot*, *Hor. Hebr. in Job. 9. 2.*

was doubtless an Error, in the Excess.---But that the Derivation or Imputation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity was a Doctrine generally received and confess'd in the Apostles Days, appears by *Paul's* arguing from it, in *Rom. 5. Ver. 12. to the End.* Where he makes Use of it as a *Medium* to prove another Doctrine by, viz. the Imputation of *Christ's Righteousness*, for the Justification of Believers. For had not the Derivation of *Adam's Guilt* to his Posterity been at that Time an acknowledg'd Principle, the whole Strength and Foundation of his Argument had failed.---And there is no Ground of Doubt but that the same Doctrine was maintain'd in the primitive Church, in the Ages next after the Apostles. Your Gentleman indeed has given you a very remarkable Narrative, about the Antiquity of this Doctrine: But I can't help looking upon it as a disguising of the Truth, from the Beginning to the End. He pretends, this Doctrine had not it's Rise till about 400 Years after Christ; and that it was first "broach'd by one *St. Augustine.*" And then he runs out a considerable Length in declaiming against this antient Father, as one that advanced very corrupt Opinions. (P. 23, 24.) Now, *St. Augustine*, it is true, was not without some Errors and Faults (and he shewed his Ingenuity in writing a Book of *Retractions.*) Nevertheless, he has been had in high Esteem by the universal Church ever since, even to this Day, as an eminent Instrument, whom God rais'd up to maintain and vindicate the Doctrines of Grace, against *Pelagius*, and other Hereticks. And the Truth of the Matter is, this *Pelagius* was the first notable Broacher of the opposite Error (the Denial of Original Sin) who held, that *Adam's Sin* did hurt none but himself; and that none of his Posterity derive any Sin or Corruption of Nature from him: And *St. Augustine* was the first notable Defender of this Doctrine (as it had been held in the Catholick Church all along) against *Pelagius*, and his Accomplices. And whereas he tells you, it was not known in the Christian World, till his Time; the plain Truth is, that altho the Doctrine of the Sin and Pollution of Man's Nature first received the Denomination of *Original Sin* from *St. Augustine*, in his Writings against the *Pelagians*; which has been retained in the Church of Christ ever since, as being a proper Expression of the Thing in-

tended by it; yet it is a foul Imposition on Mankind, to declare, as the said Gentleman does (P. 23.) "That in Fact "this Doctrine was *never heard of* in any Part of the whole "Christian World, neither the *Name*, nor the *Thing*, till 400 "Years after Christ." --- This might pass with the simple Vulgar; but 'tis amazing, he should think of publishing it to the World, and expect it would pass uncontradicted! For tho' the *Name* may not be found before St. *Austin's* Days, yet the *Thing*, under other Names, is evidently to be found in the Writings of the most eminent of the Fathers of the 2d and 3d Centuries; as *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and others. You can't expect, that in this familiar Conference, I should enter into a formal Quotation of the several Authors mentioned, to make good what I have said: However, there are two or three Passages I now call to Mind. *Tertullian* (who lived in the very Beginning of the 3d Century, about an hundred Years after the Apostles) asserts, That *every Soul is reckoned as unclean in Adam, till it be enrolled in Christ: And sinful, because unclean.* --- Again, *Origen* (who flourished a little after, in the Beginning of the same Century) is express to this Purpose, saying, *None is free from Pollution, tho' his Life be but of the Length of one Day;* -- referring to *Job 15. 4.* according to the Septuagint Translation. And he interprets that Passage of *David*, in *Psal. 51. 5.* as shewing, That *every Soul which is born in the Flesh, is polluted with Sin, even in it's Mother's Womb.* --- And *Justin Martyr* (who lived within 50 Years from the Apostles) speaks of *Mankind as fallen by Adam, under Death, and the Guile of the Serpent;* for which Reason they stood in Need of Redemption by Christ; *beside the peculiar Crime of every one of them who have done wickedly, i. e. beside their actual sinning.* Now what can he intend by the Fall of Mankind, in and by *Adam*, under Death, &c. which required Redemption by the Merits of *Christ*, beside their actual Sin, but the same thing that we mean by *Original Sin*? Neither do I remember ever to have read or heard of any Person, in the catholick Church, to have been charged with the *Denial* of this Doctrine, before *Pelagius* arose in the Beginning of the *fifth* Century. And the Reason why the Writings of the most eminent *Fathers* are no more plain and express in their Testimonies to the Truth of this Doctrine, is, because there were
no

no open Disputes about it in the Church, for the 3 or 4 first Centuries ; and so there was little or no Occasion given them to write about it, at least, to write with that Exactness, which otherwise they would have done. For it must be allow'd, that before this became a Controversy in good earnest (as it did in the Days of *Pelagius*) the Fathers express'd their Sentiments, with Relation to the Point now in Debate, and other Points depending on it, in a more lax and general Manner : and some of their less guarded Expressions have been laid hold of by the Adversaries of Original Sin, & improved to justify their Pretensions, that their Opinions are favoured by the Fathers, and the Contrary condemned ; particularly this was done by Dr. *Whitby* (whom this Gentleman refers to as his Voucher) a Writer, who (tho' a learned Man, yet) is known to be prejudiced in favour of the *Arminian*, or rather *Pelagian* Scheme (on the Point of *Original Sin* ;) for even *Arminius* himself taught more soundly, and more agreeably to Scripture, than the said Writer, touching the Derivation of *Adam's* Sin to his Posterity. And they that know how the said Writer has dealt with the *Holy Scriptures* (I mean, several Texts made Use of in this Controversy) to give them a Turn more favourable to his Scheme, will not wonder at his making bold with the Writings of the *Fathers*, in pressing them into the Service of his Cause. But divers learned Men, both *English* and *Foreigners* (particularly *Vossius*, in his *Hist. Pelagiana*) have made large Collections of the Testimonies of the *Antients*, concerning the Corruption of our Nature, long before the *Pelagian* Controversy arose ; which are abundantly sufficient to confute the foresaid Writer. Moreover let me add, It is certain, so far as we can trace the Doctrine and Practice of *Infant-Baptism* up into Antiquity, which, by the Confession of it's Adversaries, may be done as far as to the Time of *Cyprian*, in the middle of the *third* Century, not above an 150 Years from the Apostles ; indeed it may be trac'd much higher, even to the Time of *Irenæus* at least, within an 100 Years of the Apostles : So far, I say, it is certain, that the Belief of the original Pollution of our Nature obtain'd in the *antient Church* ; for this sinful Defilement of Man's Nature, from his Birth, was constantly held by the *antient Christians* as one main Ground of the Baptism of *Infants*. This Argument was strongly urged by St. *Augustine*,
against

against *Pelagius*, and his Sect, even to the confounding of their Cause.---And as to the Corruption of the following Ages, down to the Reformation, your Gentleman has set it forth in such *exaggerating* Terms, as would make one believe, that all Religion had fled from the Face of the Earth, and the Church of Christ in the World had totally fail'd. "Such was the Darkness, Ignorance, and Wickedness (saith he) of those that were called Christians,---that their Name stank again; they were the Abhorrence of the Nations round them."---But it should be remembered, that in the Times of this great Apostacy, *God reserved to himself a Remnant*, in the several Nations of *Europe*, particularly, the Churches in the Valleys of *Piedmont*, and among the *Waldenses*, 4 or 500 Years before the Reformation, who in general retain'd the Purity of the *antient Faith*, and this Article among the rest. So that this was no Part of the Corruption of those Ages, as this Gentleman would have it thought.

Come we now therefore with him to the Time of the *Reformation*. Here he represents the *first Reformers*, as divided in Relation to this Doctrine. "*Luther*," he says, "against it, and *Calvin* for it. *Zuinglius*, who may well be mentioned as a third eminent Reformer, seems also to have been with *Luther*; and if so, here are two against one."---This may serve for a *Specimen* of this Gentleman's Unfairness, and Partiality; and shews what little Credit is to be given to his Account of this Matter, taken from his Party-Writers. For I would charitably presume, he was not the Author or Forger of it: For it is such an *apparent Falshood*, as I should be loth to charge any Man with.----*Luther* (he says) was against it: yet no Man ever spake more vehemently in asserting and maintaining Original Sin, than *Luther*; of which any one may fully satisfy himself, if he will but look into his *Common-places*, collected by *Fabricius*, on the Article of *Original Sin*. He often, and strongly insists, "that all Men are *born Sinners*;" yea, that this Sin "is in the *Fœtus*, whilst living in the Womb:" And all the noted Reformers were of the same Mind.---There were, 'tis true, divers Heresies and Sects, that sprang up about the Time of the Reformation, and some that denied the Doctrine of *Original Sin*. The whole *Socinian* Tribe went this Way; but those that adhere to the true Reformation, always look'd upon them

them as *Hereticks* ; and agreed in asserting this Doctrine. If any makes a Doubt of this, they may be satisfied by consulting the *Harmony of the Confessions of the reformed Churches*, particularly the *Articles of the Church of England*, and those of the Church of *Ireland*, drawn up by Arch-Bp. *Usher*, which are full and strong, on this Point of *Original Sin*.---'Tis true, there has been for many Years past a grievous *Defection from* these Principles of the Reformation, especially towards the End of the last Century, and ever since the Beginning of this. The Doctrine now under Consideration, and several others that depend upon it, and are connected with it, which had always been esteemed as some of the most important Doctrines of *Christianity*, have either been wholly neglected, or (which is worse) perverted and decied, and treated with Contempt, by too many modern Preachers, and Writers, in the *English Nation*. And our Gentleman seems to glory in the Report of one of their own Body, that "almost all the
" Clergy of the Church of *England* profess to have given up
" these *Augustine* Doctrines, and to be on the other Side of
" the Question ;"---which is rather Matter of *Shame and Lamentation*. For, what has been the *Consequence* of such preaching and writing ? Has the Cause of *pure Religion* been serv'd thereby ? Not at all. But a Deluge of Vice and Prophaneness, Blasphemy, Deism, Infidelity, and a general Corruption of Manners, have been ever since breaking in, and overspreading the Nation, that scarce ever a Christian Nation arriv'd to such Heights of Impiety ; as has been long observ'd and lamented by all wise and good Men : Insomuch that an eminent *Prelate*, who had great Advantages for knowing the religious and moral State of the Nation, especially of the chief City, has seen Cause, not long since, to warn them in a very solemn Manner, of the Doom of *Sodom*, by Reason of the Excess of Vice and Wickedness, generally prevailing. So that whilst Men preach up the Dignity, Powers, & Capacities of the human Nature, and it's uncorrupt State from *Adam* ; the general Depravation of Morals in the Nation is too sad and dreadful a Confutation of such their Doctrine, and loudly proclaims the contrary Truth. And it has been long the fearful Apprehension of many pious, thòtful Men, that the Nation is ripening apace for some dismal Judgment, at least in Order to their Humiliation. But it is to be hop'd,
that

that the present awful Frowns of divine Providence in the distressing and burdensome *War*, and the ill Success that attends it, together with the *Earthquakes* in several Parts of *Great-Britain*, wherewith the Nation has of late been alarmed, have awakened many to a Reverence of God, and to serious Religion. And it may not be amiss, to acquaint you with something much for the Comfort and Encouragement of the Friends of *revealed Religion*, or of those that adhere to the Doctrines of the *Reformation*, that a very considerable Number of the Clergy, in the Church of *England*, have been of late stirred up to assert and preach the peculiar Doctrines and Truths of the Gospel-Revelation, such as *Original Sin*, the Necessity of *supernatural Grace*, the *imputed Righteousness* of Christ, Justification by *Faith*, &c. and to call upon their Brethren to do the like : And that great Success attends their Ministry. And I am persuaded, that as a Spirit of serious Piety revives in the Nation, these Doctrines, which have been so much neglected, yea, oppos'd and vilified by too many, will be had in great Request, and esteem'd as Doctrines most conducive to the true Interests of vital Religion : but the opposite Doctrines, that are so much in Vogue with many, as much disrelished and exploded, as being the Corruption of true Christianity.

NEI. These are agreeable Tidings indeed !-- And I am glad to hear, so much can be said for the *Antiquity* of this Doctrine. But tho' thro' Want of Reading, and of Acquaintance with Authors, I am incapable, I confess, of examining the Evidences, which you and the Opponent rely upon for the Support of your different Opinions, and am therefore no competent Judge, on which Side the Truth of Fact lies, nevertheless there appears to me far greater Probability on your Side, I must own, for the *Antiquity* of this Doctrine ; because since the *Scriptures* speak of it so fully and plainly, to my Apprehension, tho' the Name, *Original Sin*, be not found in Use before the Time of *Augustine*, yet it seems strange indeed, and even incredible, that the *Thing* signified by it, should not be found in any of the Writings of the *antient* Christians. I can't but wonder therefore, that he should say, neither *Name* nor *Thing* was heard of for 400 Years from the Apostles. But perhaps there is as much Truth in what he says
of

of them, as he would say, & does say, of the *Scriptures* themselves, that neither the *Name* nor the *Thing* (according to his Explication of them) is to be found in the Holy Scriptures.

MIN. You may be assured, those *antient Writers* speak full as plain to this Point, as the *Scriptures* any where do. I have given you a *Specimen* out of those *Writers*: and many more might easily be produced, who by their Explications and Enlargements leave no Manner of Doubt but they mean the *same Thing*, that we do by the Name, *Original Sin*, tho' they no where, so far as I know, use the *Name* itself.

NEI. I have no Reason to question your Assertion; but as for us illiterate People, who have not the Advantage or Opportunity for reading antient Authors, we must bleis God, and be satisfied, that we have the *BIBLE*, the *Oracles of God*, which are sufficient for us, to guide us in all Matters of Faith, and to guard us against Error. And I took well the *Advice*, which the Minister gave us, referring us to the *Scriptures*, that thereby we might be *led into all Truth*, &c. (P. 25.)

MIN. 'Tis good Advice; and I readily join with him in commending you to the *Law*, and to the *Testimony*: And also in the *Caution* he gave you against "*making void the Law of God by our TRADITIONS.*" Let me also add a *Caution*, against making void the Truths of the Gospel, by our Innovations, respecting the settled and generally received Articles of Faith, and by *wresting the Scripture*, to support those Innovations; which are no less dangerous, if not more so.

NEI. I am confident, he does not look on his Opinion as an Innovation, but persuades himself, that it is an *antient Truth*; for he says, "to suppose it is a *new Thing* to deny this "*Doctrine*---is a great Mistake." (P. 24.)

MIN. It is no new Thing, I confess, to deny this Doctrine; for *Pelagius* of Old deny'd it: Indeed it is the old *Pelagian Error*, new vampt.

NEI. He supposes the Contrary; and represents the Doctrine we hold, as an *Error*, and a very *bad* one; "tending to
P "much

"*much Evil*," (P. 25.) and in the concluding Part of his Conference, has set it forth in a very odious Character, and imputed very bad *Consequences* to it : Such as, he cannot but know, the Teachers & Defenders of it detest & reject, as the groundless and malicious *Invectives* of it's Adversaries ; and such as, if they could be with any tolerable Degree of Justice, Reason or Modesty, charg'd upon any Opinion whatever, were enough to beget an everlasting Abhorrence of it.---- And now, Sir, since you have highly gratified me with your Remarks hitherto, I hope you'll be pleased to carry them thro' his *Conclusion* ; that I may know what is to be said for the vindicating this Doctrine, from the *foul Aspersions* (for I can call them by no better Name) which he has cast upon it.

MIN. He does indeed represent it as an Error, and as having a dangerous Tendency. However, it is no new Thing for Men to call *Evil Good*, and *Good Evil*, to put *Darkness for Light*, and *Light for Darkness* : But you remember, there is a *WO to them* -- (Isa. 5. 20.) I shall endeavour (in a few Words) to wipe off the Reflections, or Reproaches (call them which you will) that he has thrown out upon this Doctrine, to bring an *Odium* upon it with the Vulgar. And they are so *unnatural*, so manifestly *over-strained*, that it will require no great Labour to expose their Vanity, and dissipate them.

First, He says, " Those who believe this, are apt to look " on it as a *natural Fountain* of Sin in them" (this is *true*, and Matter of Lamentation) " and so a *Cloak* for all their " Wickedness" ; this is *false*. They who believe, and have an experimental Sense of it, don't improve it to *palliate*, or even extenuate, but rather to aggravate their other Sins ; at least, to increase their Sorrow and Humiliation for them : And this is the proper Use and Tendency of this Doctrine. Or, if there be some light and vain Minds, that abuse it by making it a *Cloak* for their Sins, so there were in the Time of the *Apostles* some that abused the precious Doctrine of Gospel-Liberty, and of the Grace of God in the Justification of a Sinner, to countenance them in their Licentiousness : But this can be no Argument against the Truth of the Doctrines so abused ; which, in their right Sense & Use, have a quite contrary Tendency.---But what the Gentleman here adds, is extraordinary, and surprizing : " They pretend indeed,"

says

says he, "to *repent* of, and be *humbled* for this *natural Sin*, and "so to do more than others: But whoever will consider, "must see, that 'tis all a Delusion,----'Tis as much impossible for a Man to repent, in the evangelical Sense, and be "*ashamed* of, and *humbled* for, this Sin, as for the Make of "the World, or for the Sin of the fallen Angels. Yet some "feed themselves up with a Notion, that they *pine* and *mourn* "daily for their *Original Sin*."--- To this I say, there may be some Impropriety in the Expression, *repenting* of Original Sin; *Repentance* being, in the general Use of the Word, strictly and properly, for actual Sins: But he should know, that *Humiliation* for Sin, is a great Branch of Repentance. And there is no Impropriety, nor Impossibility, in this Humiliation and Mourning for our *natural Sin*. Is he, then, such a Stranger to *his own Heart*, as to have no Sense of it's spiritual Distempers, however he came by them? Or if he hath such a Sense, will he say, 'tis as impossible to be humbled---and mourn for them, as for the Sin of the fallen *Angels*; when this *inward Malady* (which we, according to the Scriptures, look upon as *Hereditary, & Native*) is a just Cause of Mourning, and the greatest in the World! Nay, the more holy and humble any Soul is, the more it finds it so. And indeed, those who are often exercised in mourning for the Sin of their *Nature*, and these spiritual Disorders, the immediate Issue thereof, *do more than others*, far more than carnal Professors, who are little concerned about their inward Frames. But to call this a *Delusion*, and to vilify and deride it by the canting Terms of "*pinning* and *mourning* daily for their *Original Sin*," deserves a Reflection, which I had rather the Gentleman in his cool and sober Thòts should make on himself, than I should do it for him. I pray, was *David* in a Delusion, when he mourn'd over his *Birth-Sin*, in his Confession to God? Was *Paul* in a Delusion, when he complain'd of the *Law in the Members*, warring against the *Law of the Mind*, and of the *Body of Sin and Death*? Are all those pious, devout Persons in a Delusion, who mourn before God by Reason of the power and working of the *Sin that dwelleth in them*, which they have sensible Experience of, both in holy Duties, and in their daily Conversation? Can a Man *know* and feel the *Plague of his own Heart*, and not bewail it?--Such Language as this Gentleman has used, might have been expected from

one bred up in the School of *Plato* or *Aristotle* ; not in the School of *CHRIST*, or under the Discipline of his *SPIRIT*. They that are Strangers to the Religion of the *Heart*, and to *inward* Illumination of the Spirit, which convinceth of Sin and Misery, and who content themselves with a *Pharisaical* Righteousness, may wonder at those that go *mourning* in a Sense of their Corruptions, complaining of vain *Thôts*, and the inward Disorders of the Mind ; and may think them an odd Sort of People, under a strange *Delusion*. But the true Cause of their Concern is, they aim at *exceeding* the Righteousness of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and can't be contented without Experience of the *Life* and *Power* of Religion in their *Souls*. Men may imagine all is well with them, if they keep up the Forms of Religion, hold on a Course of Duties, and are blameless in their external Deportment (as *Paul* before his Conversion, thôt of himself, *Rom. 7. 9.*) yet all the while may be carried down the Stream of natural Corruption, and in Truth favouring only the Things of the Flesh. But let a Man set the Glass of God's holy *Law* before him, which is *spiritual*, and a Rule to the Heart and *Thôts*, as well as the outward Life ; let him set himself to make head against his Corruptions, against the Torrent of evil and vain *Thôts*, against the workings of Pride, Passion, Envy, Murmuring, the sensual Inclination, the worldly Mind, &c. let him set himself, with Resolution, for the Duties of the divine Life ; worshiping God in Spirit, with all the Powers and Capacities of the Soul, intent on God and divine Things, in his Prayers and Devotions ; keeping the Heart, by constant Watchfulness, in a spiritual Frame, heavenly and pure, and chaste, meet to converse with God, and to entertain spiritual Communion with him ; loving God above this World, aiming at his Glory as the chief End of Man, maintaining an absolute Submission to his Will, doing all Things in the Name of Christ, &c. all which belongs to that spiritual and reasonable Service, which God requires of us ; let a Man, I say, set himself to do all this, according to the true & full Meaning of the Gospel-Requirements, and if his Soul be awake to God, he will soon be sensible of the Strength of the corrupt Biass, and the vile and wretched Disorders of his Soul ; he will find Matter enough for Humiliation, and Mourning, in his Confessions, and Deprecations ;

tions ; Cause enough for that Prayer of the *Psalmist*, for new-creating Grace, in Consideration of the Vileness and Sinfulness of his State by Nature. (*Psal.* 51. 5, 10.)---How uncharitable then is the Reflection, that this is all a meer *Delusion* ? Yet 'tis of a Piece with the Denial of *Original Sin*. But the Experiences & Complaints of the holiest Men, in reference to this Evil (who must be supposed most acquainted with themselves, most enlightned by the *Spirit of a sound Mind*, and consequently most remote from *Delusion*) are no small *Confirmation* of the Scripture-Doctrine concerning the original Corruption of our Nature : And truly there is most Reason to fear, those are under a *Delusion*, the most horrible *Delusion*, who never had a Sense of, and never mourned over a sinful depraved *Heart* and *Nature*. Nor can a Man mourn as he ought for his actual Sins, without bewailing this *Root of Bitterness* in the corrupt Heart, whence they all spring : It appears, *David* was of this Mind, *Psal.* 51. 4, 5.

Secondly, He tells you, "It prevents People from *thanking God* for their *Being*. If we come into the World," says he, "sinful, damnable Creatures, Objects of *divine Hatred*, and *hanging over Hell-fire*, who in his Wits would desire such a Being ?" (P. 26.) But if in Stead of *Damnable*, he had said *Condemnable* (tho' a Word of the same Import) his passionate Exclamation," in the following Words, "What a Doctrine is this ! what a Scheme is this, that won't admit us to give *thanks* to our heavenly Father for our Creation ! *God forbid*, we should ever receive such a Doctrine !" (if there be any Truth in it) may be turned against his own *Doctrine*, and his own *Scheme*. For he is forc'd to allow (what he could not deny, without rejecting the Scripture, *Rom.* 5. 18.) that we all come into the World subject to *Condemnation* (i. e. in other Terms, *Condemnable Creatures*) for the *Offence of one* (viz. *Adam*,) under which *Condemnation* we had lain for ever, without a Redeemer. And *who would desire such a Being* as this ! "And what is not to be *desir'd*, we have not any Reason to be *thankful* for."---The Objection, supposing there be any Strength in it, affects his own Scheme, if he means only a *Condemnation to Death*, which all that come into the World are liable to.---As for "*hanging over Hell-fire*," it is his own Language, dissonant from Scripture, and aliene to the Subject in Hand ; as has been more than

110 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

than once observ'd. The Language here used, speaks the Design to be nothing else but to bring our Doctrine under a popular *Odium*. This Consequence, that it prevents our being thankful to God for our Creation, is built on a false Supposition, as if we held, that God, in giving us our Being, made us the Objects of his *Hatred*;--A *Calumny*, which has often come in our Way in this present Conference, and has been sufficiently animadverted on. And it seems a *wilful Calumny*; for I can scarce think, the Gentleman believes himself, when he would represent this as *our Principle*, and that we are hindred thereby from *thanking God for our Being*. And upon this false Ground he runs out (P. 29.) in a pathetic Declamation against our Doctrine, as if it "represented the Divine Being in an *unamiable Light*:" and consequently extinguished the *Love of God*; for "how can Men *love* him, "who made them the Objects of his *Hatred*?"---That whole *Rhapsody* has not the least Foundation of Truth. *We teach*, that God at first made the *Nature* of Man (as he did all the Creatures) *good, very good*, furnished with excellent Endowments, natural and moral; and so made him the Object of his *Complacency*: But the *Corruption* of his Nature was originally *Self-contracted*, by his sinning against his Maker. And God was under no Obligation, from his Wisdom or his Justice, to prevent the *Propagation* of this Corruption with our Nature. But how much soever the Sin of the human Nature is loathsome and displeasing to God, yet we have so much the more Cause to admire and magnify his *Goodness*, in that, notwithstanding this, he gives and continues to us our Beings, reprieves us from deserved Ruin, loads* us daily with his Benefits; and has appointed a Redeemer for us, and put us into a Capacity (if we don't wilfully indulge Unbelief and Impenitency) of attaining thro' him to eternal Well-being and Happiness, that we might love, adore and bless him for ever. This is the truly *amiable Light*, in which *we* represent the divine Majesty, as infinitely worthy of all our Love and Thanks.---Whereas, those who think they come into the World *innocent*, and the just Objects of the *Favour* of God, will naturally be apt to ascribe much to *their own Merit*, and not think themselves so beholden to the *Grace of God*.---Again, *Life is desirable* to every Man, under all the Disadvantages, and Miseries, that have befallen it in this State

On the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. III

State of Apostacy. Every one (excepting some few desperate forlorn Wretches) desires Life; and how poor, and miserable soever (yea, tho' hanging over Hell-Fire) would by all Means have it continued. Life in it's lowest Circumstances, on this Side Death and Hell, is attended with so much Good, that it is preferred before sinking into a State of Not-being. Therefore that which is so desirable, there is Reason, with the good Leave of this Gentleman, to be thankful for.

Thirdly, He further suggests, that "It tends to weaken the tender Affection of Parents towards their Children; for if they are the Objects of God's Hatred and Wrath, what ought Parents to think but that they are really hateful?---And why then should they not hate them? Would they not herein be Imitators of GOD?" (P. 26.) The Sum of his Argument is to this Effect: If Infants are born Objects of God's Hatred, then they are hated by God: And if so, why should not their Parents hate them? For this would be only to imitate God. But I don't see how the Gentleman could talk thus, if he were sufficiently acquainted with the Things of God, and with the Principles of human Nature. 'Tis true, there is in Infants *That* which is hateful and displeasing to God, viz. the Sin, in which they were born: But this notwithstanding, God can, and doth love their Persons, with a Love of *Pity*. He compassionates their Case, even while the Sin, cleaving to their Nature, is loathsome to him. Alas! if God cannot love those, in whom he sees what is infinitely displeasing to him, *WO to us all*. When the Apostle had described the Sinfulness and Misery of a natural State, to the Ephesians (Chap. 2. 1,---4.) *Ye were dead in Trespasses and Sins, wherein in Time past ye walked, &c. and were by Nature the Children of Wrath*; here is a Description of the Objects of God's Displeasure and Hatred; yet he immediately adds (Ver. 4.) *But God, who is rich in Mercy, for the great LOVE wherewith he loved us, even WHEN we were DEAD in Sins, hath quickened us*. Here God is said to love even *Children of Wrath*, i. e. with a Love of Benevolence and Compassion; tho' not with a Love of Complacency, till by his Grace he quickens them, and so makes them the Objects of it. (See also Rom. 5. 8. & 1 Joh. 4. 10.) In that parabolical Description of the deplorable State of the Jews, in the first Rise or Beginning of their Nation, by the Similitude of a

new born Infant (*Ezek. 16.*) which is very aptly applied to illustrate the sinful and wretched State of all the Children of Men by Nature, there is an Instance to our Purpose : *Thou wast cast out* (saith God, *Ver. 5.*) *to the loathing of thy Person in the Day that thou wast born.* And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own Blood, I said unto thee, when thou wast in thy Blood, *LIVE*.---It follows (*Ver. 8.*) *When I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy Time was the Time of LOVE, &c.* Here we see, that the blessed God can find in his Heart to love, even where he sees nothing but Matter of loathing. Thus God loves the sinful polluted Children of Men (who, as such, are the just Objects of his Hatred) with a Love of Pity and Good-will, in making Provision of Grace for their cleansing, & healing. And if God thus loves our Children in the Blood and Pollution (i. e. the Sinfulness and Misery) of their natural State, surely, so ought Parents to love their Children ; bearing a tender Affection to their Persons (tho' hating whatever appears in them to deserve their Hatred, yet) pitying them under the Miseries of their fallen corrupt State : employing their Prayers and Cares for them, that the Remedy of God's Grace may be applied to them. This is to love like God : and thus they ought to be *Imitators of God*.---Again, God has implanted in the Hearts of all Parents a natural Affection to their Children, how vile and sinful soever. *Ye being evil* (saith our Saviour, *Luk. 11. 13.*) *know how to give good Gifts unto your Children.* Nature itself teaches Parents to love their Children : and surely to obey the Law of Nature, is to obey the God of Nature.---This therefore appears but an unreasonable Cavil.

Fourthly, He represents it as a Discouragement from *Marriage*. He says, " It would lead People into the old Error of some ancient Hereticks, who abstain'd from *Marriage*, because they would not propagate an evil Nature.---Sure, voluntarily to propagate Sin, make Rebels against God, and Heirs of Damnation, can hardly be the Work of an holy and good Man." (P. 12) But this an Objection so silly, and ridiculous, that I should never have thot, it would have been taken up by any Man of Sense, much less have been seen in Print, had not some Reputation been given it by it's being made Use of by such a Man as Dr. *Whitby* ; from whom, I suppose, this Gentleman borrow'd it. But

to discover the Weakness & Impertinency of it, there needs nothing more, but to remind you, that Marriage was an Institution of God in *Paradise*, before ever Sin entred ; and a wise and good Institution it was ; and is become the more necessary since the Fall, to restrain and confine the exorbitant Lusts of Men, that they might not be left to range after the Manner of Brutes, and follow their lustful Inclinations at Random ; but that they might be reduc'd into Order, and a Foundation might be laid for Societies and Relations among Men.---And since every *good* Man hath God's Covenant and Promise (to *Abraham*) belonging to him, and his *Seed*, he has Hope towards God for his *Children*, born to him under a Dispensation of Grace, that they shall be Partakers of the Remedy therein provided, against the evil Effects of the first Apostacy. And he may be suppos'd to have the *same* thing in View, in entering into *Marriage*, which God had in the Institution of it, viz that *he might seek a godly Seed* (Mal. 2. 15.)---Not “*voluntarily* to propagate Sin, and make Rebels against God,” &c. (which cannot be “the Work of a *good* Man,” ’tis true, nor scarce of a wicked Man) but to increase the Subjects of the Kingdom of Christ, and propagate his holy Religion, and add to the Number of the Heirs of Salvation. And there is no Doubt but this may be the Work of a holy and good Man. --- Moreover, the Argument (if it be one) is built on a false Supposition, That nothing is to be undertaken, or done, which hath *Sin* accidentally adhering to it, or consequent upon it ; how remote soever from the Will and Intention of the Agent. But every one with a little Reflection may easily discern, how weak and frivolous, yea how false such a Pretence is.

Fifthly, He would persuade you, that “ This and such like “ Doctrines tend dreadfully to promote *Infidelity*.”--- But it had been more advisable in the Gentleman, to have waved this Reflection, since it is so easy to be resorted. For the *Denial* of Original Sin, and of the other Doctrines dependent on it, has a most apparent Tendency toward *Disbelief* and *Infidelity* ; as it leads People into an Opinion of the Sufficiency of *Natural Religion*. For if the Apostacy of the human Nature be denied, the Fall of *Adam*, original Corruption, and consequently the Necessity of supernatural Grace, Redemption by the Blood of Christ, Regeneration by the Spirit, Ju

ification by Faith, &c. (all which are so connected with each other, that if you take away one, the other fall of Course, or at least are greatly weaken'd) I say, if these Doctrines be denied and rejected, which we look upon as the great Truths of *Revelation*, I see not what should stop Men from going into the Conclusion, that *natural Religion* is a sufficient Guide to Happiness : at least, from the Denial of *Original Sin*, the Passage lies open and easy into the Camp of *Deists*. --- The *Deists* are too discerning, not to see how the Doctrines of *Original Sin*, the Redeemer's Atonement, effectual regenerating Grace, and the other Articles mentioned, are plainly laid down in *Scripture* : And 'tis *this*, that gives them a *Disgust* to the *Scriptures*, which contain these Doctrines ; and not, because any Number of Christians honestly hold to them. But when they see profess'd Christians *explain away*, or rather *wrest* those *Scriptures* that contain them, to a quite different and contrary Meaning, they are apprehensive, that really at bottom such Men believe little or nothing more of the true Doctrines of the Scripture-Revelation, than *themselves* ; full as little as themselves, in respect, at least, of those peculiar Points of Revelation : and scarce any thing more than what the Bible contains of *natural Religion*. Yet for the sake of their Interest and Credit among Christians, and to avoid the Infamy of being reputed Unbelievers, they profess a mighty Veneration for the *Scriptures*, and so make themselves the *Scorn of Infidels*, who are thereby hardned in their Unbelief, and Contempt of the Scripture-Revelation. It is this, indeed, that tends dreadfully to promote Infidelity ; and 'tis a Fact, I think, not to be disputed, that since the prevailing of the Opinions opposite to those Scripture-Doctrines above-mentioned, there has been a dreadful Increase of *Deism* and *Infidelity*, in the Nation. --- And admitting that some may turn Infidels thro' Disgust at these *Doctrines*, yet it can't be supposed, that they should have that Influence on any Man of Sense, as to move him to reject the Authority of the *Scripture-Revelation* it self, if he did not plainly perceive those Doctrines to be contained in that Revelation. But the Apostle Peter assigns the true Cause (1 Pet. 2. 8.) They *stumble at the Word, being disobedient*. They are offended at the Doctrine of Christ, because they proudly set up their own Reason and Will, in Opposition to it ; and do not meekly & obediently submit

submit to the Authority of God's Word : But the Doctrine of *Original Sin* has no Tendency, in it's own Nature, to Infidelity. Nay, it properly tends to support the Honour and Credit of divine Revelation ; as Man's *Apostacy* from his first State is supposed as the Foundation of *Redemption* by Christ, the great Subject of the Gospel-Revelation.

Sixthly, In the last Place, he would have it believed, that this Doctrine " naturally leads Men into very *dishonourable* " *Thoughts* of GOD, which gives a great and general Blow " to Religion."--This is the Way of these Men, when they are beat out of their Defence in the Scripture, then to have Recourse to Arguments from the *Perfections of God* ; and to raise a tragical Outcry of the great *Dishonour* our Doctrine reflects on God's moral Attributes ; as if their shallow and partial Conceits of the infinite Perfections of God, were the Rule and Standard of all Truth. This Gentleman instances in the Justice, Holiness and Goodness of God.

As for the *Justice* of God, he is positive, that " this Doctrine can never be reconciled to it ; as it charges Him with " condemning Millions to *Hell-flames*, who are *perfectly* innocent and blameless." (P. 27.) As for *Hell-flames*, which constantly come into the Account, I have often observed, they have no Place in the present Question, concerning the Imputation & Derivation of *Adam's Sin* to his natural Progeny, and the penal Consequences of it they lie under, which are visibly extended unto *Death*. Whether, or how far, these penal Effects may be extended *beyond Death*, in a future State, is *another* Question ; and a Question concerning *secret* Things which belong only to God. And tho' we don't (with this Gentleman) hold Infants to be *perfectly innocent*, but the contrary ; yet neither do we hold Infants liable, eventually, to the Punishment of *Hell* hereafter : But still we think, those who affirm, that God would be *unjust*, in the inflicting any Degree of future Punishment on such Infants (whom they are pleased to call *Innocents*) are guilty of a most daring Presumption, in prescribing Limits to the holy One of Israel ? Alas ! we are obnoxious Creatures, and Parties too nearly interested, to be capable of an impartial Estimate of the Rights of divine Justice.---But now is not this Gentleman's own Scheme as irreconcilable to *Justice*, and much more so ; who holds these Millions *perfectly innocent*, and yet concedes

(as has been observed) that they are *condemned* to bodily Death? How can it possibly consist with any rational Idea of *Justice*, to *condemn* one to *Death*, who is intirely *innocent*? much less, *Millions*! --- For our Part, we easily get clear of this Difficulty, by admitting the Scripture-Account, that they all *sinned* in their first Progenitor; who was constituted their natural and federal *Head*: But in no other Way can the *Justice* of God be saved. I remember, to this Purpose, a Passage of St. *Austin*, in Reply to *Julian*, a *Pelagian* Writer; who objected, "It is a thing incomprehensible, that God should at the same time be so *merciful*, as to forgive every one *their own* Sins upon their penitent Confession, and yet so *cruel*, as to impute the Sins of *another* to an *Innocent*:" So he called an *Infant*.--- St. *Austin* answers, "It is *you*, rather, that make God *unjust*, when you can't but see, under the Providence of almighty God, *little Ones* oppressed with a grievous Yoke of *Affliction & Misery*, and yet affirm, they have *no Sin*; thereby accusing God of afflicting them *undeservedly*."

Our Gentleman goes on to another Attribute of God, his *Holiness*. "How does it impeach the *Holiness* of God? for it supposes him to make Millions *Sinners*, by his Decree of *Imputation*, who would otherwise have been *innocent*." (*Ibid.*) This *Calumny* has already met with it's deserved Censure. The Expressions here used, are as improper, as false. The Truth is, it is neither the *Decree*, nor *Imputation*, that makes Men *Sinners*: but it is the *Sin* of the first Progenitor of the human Race (which is supposed in the *Imputation* of it) that makes all Men *Sinners*, to the End of the World. We, rather, by our Doctrine, magnify the *Holiness* of God, and give him the Glory of it, while we represent him as of purer Eyes than to behold the Seeds of *Iniquity* in our depraved Nature, and that *Thirst after Sin*, in the Lusts of our corrupt Hearts, which renders us *abominable* to him. (*Job* 15. 14, 16.) Whereas, those have but a superficial Notion and slight Thôts of the *Holiness* of God, who confine it to his Abhorrence of *actual* Sins.

Come we now to the next Attribute he mentions, the *Goodness* of God. Here the Gentleman raises his Exclamation to the height of Warmth & Vehemence. --- "O good Father of Heaven, & Earth, what doleful Apprehensions
" must

“ must they have of this thine Excellency and Glory, who
 “ can suppose that thou shouldst pronounce a Sentence where-
 “ by Myriads of Infants, as blameless as helpless, were con-
 “ signed over to *Blackness of Darkness*, to be *tormented with*
 “ Fire and Brimstone for ever !”--- But this Gentleman did
 not consider, that *we* are by no Means concerned in the *Sup-*
position, made in this passionate Out-cry. And if it was his
 Aim, to make his well-meaning *Neighbours* believe, that this
 is the real Sentiment of all that hold the Doctrine of
Original Sin, he shamefully abuses us, and imposes upon
 them. Indeed, he must think his *Neighbours* of a very
 dull Understanding, or hard to be wröten on, that he should
 so often inculcate upon them his *innocent Millions, & Myriads*
of Infants, their suffering the Pains of *Hell*, which he often
 repeats in a Variety of shocking and most terrifying Ex-
 pressions, to rouse the Passions ; for which Purpose it seems
 wholly calculated, rather than to inform the Mind, or con-
 vince the Judgment : And he brings in the Character of “ a
 “ *cruel monstrous TYRANT*,” which, if applied to the holy
 GOD (as it is intended to blacken our Scheme) in the De-
 struction of the Infants of the *Old World*, and of *Sodom*, by
 his more immediate Hand, carries in it *Idea's* too full of Hor-
 ror to bear a formal Quotation, or Confutation. I shall not
 follow him any further in his patherick Exclamations and
 Reveries on this Head. All that requires a rational Atten-
 tion, has been already fully consider'd. A carnal Fancy may
 draw a *Self pleasing*, but *false* Picture of the *Goodness* of God :
 For Instance, it were wonderful great *Goodness*, if God should
 give up the Rights of his *Justice*, so far as to remit Sin with-
 out any Satisfaction or Atonement ; yea, and receive finally
 impenitent Sinners to Mercy, and not be so cruel as to cast
 them into Hell : this would be marvelous *Goodness*, and
 Clemency. But if the divine *Goodness* answer not this *Idea*
 of a vain Imagination, shall he not be Good ! Shall he not
 be God ! Must *Cruelty* be predominant in his Character !
 O insufferable Boldness and Presumption in poor vain Mor-
 tals, to define and prescribe Measures to the Exercise and
 Manifestation of this divine Perfection ! Such Men ought
 to know, that God is *Wisdom, Justice, Holiness*, and every o-
 ther Perfection, as well as *Goodness & Mercy*. God knows
 how to maintain the Honour of his *Goodness*, in a full Con-
 sistency

sistency with the Rights of his rectoral *Holiness* and *Justice* ; and will have numberless Myriads of happy Spirits, and blessed Saints, redeemed from among Men, the Monuments and Adorers of his free Grace, to all Eternity : while Multitudes of offending Creatures shall feel the Resentments of his affronted Justice and Holiness *

I shall only add one Thing more, observable in your Gentleman (that must not be passed over) which deserves a severer Censure. You tell me, he is a *Minister* : I am sorry, he should be so forgetful of *his Character*, as to pay so little Reverence to the *third Commandment* ; when speaking of the *innocent Millions of Mankind*, he hath this Expression,---“in-
“nocent--- (*God knows*) as innocent as can be” (P. 28.) thereby *appealing* to the omniscient God, for the *Truth* of that which his Word (if we understand it) declares to be false ; and which the Gentleman himself owns to be false, in some Sense, when he confesses (P. 13.) The Scripture (in *Rom. 5.*) “re-
“presents us as having sinned *in* or *by* Adam, *in some Sense*
“or other.”---Now in what Sense soever we may be supposed to have *sinned in Adam*, we can by no Means be said, with *Truth*, to be *pure* and *innocent* ; much less, as *innocent as can be* ; meaning, it is impossible we could be more innocent. I hope he will consider it, in his serious Hours, with the proper Reflections.---These are all the Remarks I need make on his Conclusion.

NEI. I think (Sir) you have said enough fully to vindicate this Doctrine from the slanderous Imputations it has been loaded with : And I hope, I shall be more firmly than ever established in the Belief of it, notwithstanding all the Cavils, Calumnies and Invectives of it's Adversaries. But if the *contrary* Opinion be an *Error*, as we justly suppose it to be, may we not more truly tax it with as bad, or worse *Consequences*, than those which he has charg'd on our Doctrine of *Original Sin*, esteeming it an Error ?

MIN.

* They set at Odds Heav'ns jarring Attributes,
And, with one Excellence, another wound,
Maim Heav'ns Perfection, break the equal Beams,
Bid Mercy triumph over — GOD himself,
Undeify'd by their opprobrious Praise ;
A God all Mercy, is a God unjust.

YOUNG's Night-Thoughts. (4th Night.)

MEN. Well thought on ; more truly and justly we may. If our Doctrine be an *Error*, yet those forementioned *Consequences* are for the most Part very unreasonable and unjust : And I am sure, it is an *Error*, that *Nature* is not fond of, nay, rather we should account our selves so far happy, if our Doctrine were *not true*, and should be as willing to reject it, as our Adversaries : but we are awed by the plain Testimonies of God's Word, confirm'd by our own sad Experiences. Wherefore we receive it, as an undoubted Truth, tho' a lamentable one. And I was about to add (when you prevented me) in Stead of those *Chimerical* Consequences, which this Gentleman has unjustly and invidiously imputed to our Doctrine, I might suggest the *real* bad and dangerous Consequences of the opposite Error. But here you must expect at present only a few Hints this Way.--(1.) The Denial of this Sin of our Nature greatly hinders a thorow Conviction of Men's Need of the great Redeemer and Physician of Souls, and of his Work and Office in the Affair of their Salvation. (*Mar.* 2. 17.)* (2.) It tends to take Men off from that deep and thorow Humiliation of Soul, in a Sense of the Sinfulness and Misery of their Condition, and utter Helplessness in themselves, and Inability of themselves to recover out of it, which is necessary to prepare them for the Grace of God in Christ. (3.) It tends to flatter them with a Conceit of their own Power and Ability for spiritual Good, for Repentance towards God, and Faith in Christ. If they believe, their Nature and natural Faculties are spiritually sound, and uncorrupt, therefore they delay those Duties, on which Salvation depends, because they have it in their own Power to do them, when they please ; which proves the undoing of Thousands. (4.) Consequently it abates their Esteem of, and Desires after the supernatural Grace of God in Regeneration, and their Zeal and Earnestness in Prayer and Endeavours to obtain it. (5.) It tends to satisfy Men in a Course of religious Formality, without Experience of any Heart-Work in Religion, all their Days ; and so leaves Professors hardened in their Secularity, to their Ruin. (6.) It is a great Impediment to the important Duty of Mortification, which is necessary to Life, spiritual and eternal. (*Rom.* 8. 13.) And this consists not

in

* Sublato peccato originali, quid Christo opus est ? *Luther.*

in a meer refraining from the outward Act of Sin, but in suppressing and extirpating the inward Lust, in striking at the Root of it in the corrupt Heart. But if Men are not sensible of their natural Corruptions, how shall they ever strive to mortify them? (7.) It tends to make Men easy and contented in a low, dark, lifeless State of Religion, without aspiring after the Life, Likeness, and Love of God, which is the End and Perfection of all Religion, and which was the Perfection and Felicity of Man in his first State. But how should they who are utterly insensible of their sad Degeneracy, and know not from whence they are fallen, be moved to re-aspire after their divine Original? The Loss of the moral Image of God in the Soul of Man is the greatest Misery we lie under, in this State of Apostacy; but they that know not from what Height of Dignity and Happiness, in Conformity to God and Communion with him, they are fallen, are apt to content themselves with the low Entertainments of the present animal Life, without reaching after the Divine, in that Method prescribed and directed in the Gospel of Christ. (8.) It tends to other Errors, and those very dangerous ones, that are closely connected with it; if it does not settle in *Disin* at last, to which, as has been observ'd, it too nearly approaches. As a late learned and judicious Divine, speaking of the Difference between *Arminian & Pelagian* Tenets, says concerning the first, "Most Men are now agreed to bear with one another, in any Difference about 'em; but they that would obliterate the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, and the *Necessity of God's Grace*, we know not *whither* they would lead us, nor *what Part* of our Religion they will *leave* us."---These are Consequences, that import extream Danger to the Souls of Men. (9.) And let me add, it tends to diminish our Gratitude for the Redeemer's Love and Grace. They that never knew nor felt the Bondage and Burden of the Sin that dwelleth in them, will not prize a Deliverer, as they ought; nor be thankful for their Deliverance. They who cannot join with the Apostle in sighing out his Complaint, *O wretched Man, that I am! who shall deliver me from the Body of this Death!* will but faintly join with him in that gratulatory Acknowledgment, *Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ* (and for Jesus Christ) *our Lord Redeemer.*

NEI. I am sensible, you have given but too just a Representation of the bad Tendencies, and dangerous Consequences of the Denial of this Doctrine of *Original Sin*. But doubtless our Adversaries will *disown* them; and perhaps say, you have *wrong'd* them, in charging these Consequences on their Opinion.

MIN. If this can be fairly made to appear, I am ready to do Justice to them, and to the Truth: But the Consequences I have mentioned, are the genuine Effects of that *Insensibility* to the Corruption of Nature, which is supposed and implied in the *Denial* of it. I know not, that I have overstrained the Matter in any one Instance; and many more might be added. I can scarce forbear the mention of one, *viz.* It makes People pass over Abundance of Sins, without any just Sense of them, or Grief and Humiliation for them: Such as the first Motions of the Heart towards Sin, previous to the Consent of the Will; vain Thôts in holy Duties; idle Words, &c. They reckon these to be no Sins; as having nothing criminal in them; but look on them as innocent Infirmities, or even the Result of the Make or Composition of the human Nature. And to this Purpose, they have a corrupt Maxim, that *what cannot be help'd is no Sin*. But this, however it may pass in *Pagan* Divinity, is evidently false in the *Christian*: which gives another Definition of Sin. 1 *Joh.* 3. 4. *Sin is (Anomia) Unconformity to the Law*; as it might be rendered. And so every Act of a reasonable Creature, in which there is any *Want of Conformity* to the Law, is Sin. But who can help all such Defects? For Instance, *vain Thôts* in Prayer, and holy Duties; these are disagreeable to the Law of God: therefore saith the *Psalmist*, *I hate vain Thoughts; but thy Law do I love.* (Psal. 119. 113.) And if an holy Man hates *vain Thoughts*, much more doth an holy God: But where is the holy Man upon Earth, who is able to make one solemn Prayer (of any Extent) without *vain Thoughts*, tho' his utmost Vigilance and Care be used to prevent 'em? Must not the best of God's Children confess, with the Apostle, *When I would do Good, Evil is present with me?* (Rom. 7. 21.) All our Relief and Comfort, against such Defects, is the perfect Righteousness of Christ, and the Atonement in his Blood. And we must say, *Thanks be to God thro' Jesus Christ*, there is

no Condemnation to them that are in Christ, to penitent Believers, who thro' him hope for a perfect Redemption and Sanctification at last.---Not to add, what Abundance of Wickedness may be covered by the foresaid *Maxim*, in the more profligate and profane, who are *accustomed to do Evil* ! Therefore it is to be rejected as false and pernicious. --But I say, that the sad Consequences mention'd, must needs flow from the *Want of a due Sense* of our natural Corruption, which the *Denial* of it supposes, or infers. Therefore, even tho' People have right Sentiments, in *Speculation*, of this Evil of original Corruption, yet if they have not an inward, deep, experimental, and practical *Sense* of it in their own Hearts (which, it is to be fear'd, is the Case of very many among Professors) they are in Danger of the same woful Consequences and Effects.

NEI. I can readily assent to the Truth of what you have declared, that an *Insensibility* of this Corruption of our Nature is necessarily supposed in the *Denial* of it. For if Men had that *Sense* of this spiritual Plague, these vile Distempers of Heart, which, by the Grace of God, I hope I have been in some Measure enlighten'd and enabled to see & bewail, they could no longer, I am persuaded, hesitate, or doubt of the Truth of our Doctrine : and I pray God, I may retain an humbling Sense of it as long as I live ; that Christ may be daily precious to me, as a Physician and Saviour : and that I may be the better reconciled to a Dissolution of my earthly Tabernacle, when I shall put off *this Body of Sin and Death*, with all the Relicks of Corruption, which are so prejudicial to my Comfort & Peace, as well as Purity, in the present World.---And as for those that have not the like Sense and Experience of this Evil, I am so far from being angry with them for their Opposition to me, that I can heartily pity 'em, and pray for 'em, that God would open their Eyes, and change their Hearts ; that seeing and knowing themselves to be *wretched and miserable*, --- they might more readily fall in with the Redeemer's wise and compassionate Counsel & Prescription, *Rev. 3. 17, 18.*---that they might be deliver'd out of so dangerous a State.---The *Minister*, I perceived, after all his warm Declamations against this Doctrine, and the Espousers of it, yet towards the Close, began to relent, and express'd the *good Opinion* he had of many who hold this Doctrine, that "amidst
all

all these Clouds & Darknefs, they truly love God." (P. 29.) But he intimates, the *Ground* of this his good Opinion is, that he is persuaded, they don't duly *consider*, nor fully *understand* the bad Consequences of it.---I wish, those who say such Things, were in no worse Error.

MIN. We are obliged to him for his Charity ; and in Return, I am willing to declare my Candour, and let you know that I hope well of many, who thô they be not clear in the Doctrine of the *Imputation* of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity, by Reason of some Difficulties objected, nor in the *Manner of Conveyance* of a corrupt *Nature* to them, yet have such actual *Experience* of a carnal *Heart*, and corrupt *Nature*, as puts them upon Humiliation and Mourning for it, as well as for the Sins of their *Lives*, and brings them to see their Need of *Christ*, and to repair to him for Healing, and Salvation. Such as these, think with us, in the main : And I can't but attribute it to an unaccountable *Inattention* to the plain Doctrine of Scripture, and perhaps to their own Experiences, that they are not more clearly convinced, nor more fully persuaded both of the one and the other ; viz. both the Imputation and Propagation of the first Sin. ---But I cannot be free to say the same of those who reject it with *Scorn*, and make it the Subject of *Banter*, and *Derision* : Such I leave to God and their own Consciences, for Conviction. And as for the *Minister*, with whom you conversed, and who has unhappily taken up the Defence of this Error (as he lies hid to me in the *Shades of the Evening*, and as you have thôt fit to conceal his Name) I hope he will not take any thing I have said, as a *personal* Reflection upon him, since I am an entire Stranger to his Person ; nor do I bear any Prejudice against him, or any Man, because of his different Sentiment from mine. All that I am concerned for, is the Cause of *Truth* and *Holinefs* ; to which, the *Error* you invited me to confer about, I look upon as exceeding detrimental.

NEI. Thô I have already taken up too much of your Time, indulge me in one Request more (Sir) if it be not thôt impertinent : And yet, I think, there was full Occasion given for it by the Minister, in his Conference.

124 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

MIN. What is that? Let me hear it, if it be of any Importance.

NEI. You observe, the said Gentleman, in his printed Piece, all along pronounces our Doctrine of *Original Sin* irrational, and unscriptural: repeatedly, and with great Confidence he asserts, in the Close of the Conference (and pretends to have prov'd) "that it is contrary to Reason, and "has no solid Foundation in the Word of God." On the other Hand, Sir, you have asserted, that the Scriptures abound with Testimonies to the Truth of this Doctrine. Now, tho' I am persuaded, from those Texts you have already been at the Pains to vindicate, that it has a true *scriptural Foundation*; yet you have rais'd my Expectations of *much more*, deliver'd in the sacred Oracles, in Confirmation of it. My only Desire therefore is, that you would just point me to some of those Texts, or Passages of Scripture, that make for this Purpose, which have not yet come in our Way; for I can't expect, after so much Time spent in this Conference, that you should enlarge in any Explication of them.

MIN. That the Gentleman has prov'd this Doctrine to be *contrary to Reason*, is but an empty Boast. I suppose, he here refers particularly to his Reasonings from the *divine Perfections*: But how vain and frivolous these are, we have in Part seen already. God alone fully knows what is becoming his Perfections; and if he has revealed this Doctrine in his Word, 'tis not for Men (who, as the offending Party, are too much prejudic'd in Favour of themselves) to set up their fallible Reasonings in Opposition to divine Revelation. The Words of God to *Job* are enough to silence such Pretenders; *Job* 40. 2. *Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty, instruct him? He that reproveth God, let him answer it.* All the Question therefore is, Whether this be a Doctrine of the Word of God? Or whether what we call Original Sin, *imputed* and *inherent*, hath a *solid Foundation* in the Scripture-Revelation?---As to the *Imputation* of Adam's first Sin to his natural Descendents, I think, this has been abundantly cleared up, and confirmed from sacred Scripture, that I need say no more upon it. As to Original Sin *inherent*, or the Depravity of Man's Nature, some few Texts usually pleaded in Proof hereof, have been considered, and vindicated; which the
said

said Gentleman calls the *Principal*, and has endeavoured to wrest out of our Hands : But to how little Purpose, you have already seen.---Now, as to this Part of the Doctrine, I have observ'd, that the Scripture almost every where abounds in Testimonies to it ; besides those in the Texts, which he has singled out. But to insist on the chief of these, with their proper Explications, would be a Task too long and operose, to be gone thro' at this Time ; I shall therefore, in Compliance with your Request, only point out to you such Passages, under several Heads of Scripture, as do either directly or consequentially confirm this Point of our *Original Corruption*.

First, It may be inferred from the *Names* given in Scripture to this Sin, whereby it is denominated & distinguished from actual Sins. Tho' the Name, *Original Sin*, be not extant in Scripture, yet the *Thing* intended by it is copiously and in a great Variety of Terms asserted, and explained therein. Such as (1.) The *evil Imagination* of Man's *Heart*. Gen. 8. 21. of which before.--- (2.) Folly bound up in the *Heart*. Prov. 22. 15. *Foolishness is bound in the Heart of a Child ; but the Rod of Correction shall drive it far from him*. By *Foolishness*, he does not mean any *natural* Disorder or Weakness of the Mind ; the Rod of Correction is no Cure for *that* ; but a *moral* Distemper, and Weakness : And this not only apparent in the Practice of a Child, but latent in his *Heart* ; and said to be bound in his *Heart*, as being born and bred with him.--- (3.) 'Tis called a *Heart desperately wicked*, Jer. 17. 9.---And (4.) *Flesh* is another Appellation, commonly given in Scripture, to our natural Corruption. Job. 3. 5, Gen. 6. 2. Rom. 8. 1, &c. of which I have spoken before.--- (5.) 'Tis also called the *old Man*, in several Places. Rom. 6. 6. Eph. 4. 22. Col. 3. 9. Which must necessarily be understood of Man's *Nature*, as vitiated and corrupted ; because it hath *Lusts* and *Deeds* attributed to it, which signify actual Sins, that flow from a corrupt Nature, and are distinguished from the *old Man*, as the Effects from their Cause. *The old Man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful Lusts*. Again, *Ye have put off the old Man with his Deeds*. It is called the *old Man*, because it is the Image of the *first Adam*, as fallen and corrupt ; and because it is propagated to us by our natural Generation and Birth : It is as *old* as the Fall of *Adam*, and is born and bred with

126 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation,*

with us.---And also in Opposition to the *new Man*, which consists in Knowledge, Righteousness, and true Holiness ; whereto, by the Grace of the *second Adam*, we are renewed. *Eph. 4. 24. Col. 3. 10.*---(6.) The *Body of Sin* is a Name given it, *Rom. 6. 6. Col. 2. 11.* And the *Body of Death* is another of it's Names, *Rom. 7. 24.* It is a *Body of Sin*, as it consists of many Parts or Members, even the several Lusts, by which it exerts itself, as the Body doth by it's Members ; the Lusts of Pride, of Envy, of Covetousness, of Uncleaness, and the rest, *Col. 3. 5.* And because it reigns in the *Body*, wherein we obey the Lusts thereof, *Rom. 6. 12.*--- And it cleaves as close to us, as the Soul to the Body ; nor is wholly put off, even by the Regenerate, till a Dissolution by Death. *Rom. 8. 10.* Therefore being a *Body of Sin*, it is doom'd to be a *Body of Death.*---(7.) The *Sin that dwelleth in us* : as the Apostle makes his Complaint, *Rom. 7. 20. If I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but Sin that dwelleth in me.* Actual Sins are *transient* ; only the Guilt remains : But this is an inherent, permanent Principle in the Heart ; it abides and works there, in vain, sinful, impure Thôts, Imaginations and Lusts, hindring from, or indisposing to that which is *good*, even when it ceases to put forth itself in the outward Acts of Sin. And what can this be, but *Original Sin*, or the Corruption of Nature ?---(8.) It is called a *Law of Sin.* *Rom. 7. 23. I see another Law in my Members, warring against the Law of my Mind, and bringing me into Captivity to the Law of Sin.* (So, *Ver. 25.*) And simply, a *Law* ; *Ver. 21. I find a Law, that when I would do Good, Evil is present with me.* Now what is this *Law of Sin*, which even the Regenerate complain of, as that which *captivates* and inclines them to *Evil*, contrary to the Dictates of their enlighten'd and renewed *Mind*, but that Corruption of Nature, which they derived from their first Birth, & still remains after Regeneration ; thò the Power and Dominion of it is taken away by Grace ? It is called the *Law of Sin*, as it is a powerful Principle, which has the Force of an inward *Law*, impelling Men to Sin, but prohibiting and restraining them from Duty. As a *Law*, it teaches and directs Men to do *Evil* ; that they need no other Instructor. Alas, how much Pains is required, to bring Children to any *Good*, by Instruction, and Correction ! They need to have *Line upon Line, Precept upon Precept* : and
all

all little enough, nay, too little with many. But they don't need to be taught how to sin, how to tell a Lie, to break the Sabbath, and the like. They are betimes *wise to do Evil*. Sins they have never seen committed, nor perhaps heard of, they can run into with all Readiness and Freedom, without a Teacher. Now whence is this? Why should they not be as free and ready to that which is *good*? 'Tis because they have not the *Law of God* in their Heart; but the *Law of Sin* within them directs and prompts them to it. Tho' it must be acknowledged, under the Grace of God, a pious Education makes an Alteration of the Case with some Children.---(9.) To add no more, it is called *the evil Treasure of the Heart*. Luk. 6. 45. *An evil Man out of the evil Treasure of his Heart, bringeth forth that which is Evil*. Out of this evil Treasure is brôt forth all the Evil, that is in the Thôts, Words and Actions of Men.----Now, on the whole, tho' some of these Terms or Appellations may, perhaps, be applied to actual Sins, yet they all refer primarily or chiefly to this original Corruption, and most of them can be understood of nothing else.

Secondly, It may be argued and infer'd from all such Passages of Scripture, as speak of the *universal Degeneracy* of Mankind, which rendered the Coming of a *Redeemer* necessary. As, *Psal. 14. 1, 2, 3.---They are corrupt, they have done abominable Works, there is none that doth Good. The Lord looked down from Heaven upon the Children of Men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy, there is none that doth good; no, not one.* On the View of this sad and deplorable State of Mankind, the *Psalmist* concludes with a pathological Wish or Prayer for the Coming of the expected *Messiah*, or Saviour. *Ver. 7. O that the Salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!---The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, quotes these Passages, with sundry others from the old Testament, Rom. 3. 10,---18. Where his View is to show, that Jews and Gentiles are all under Sin (Ver. 9.) or as he concludes (Ver. 19.) that all the World is become Guilty before God. For all have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God (Ver. 23.) That he might make Way for his Doctrine of the Necessity of Christ's Redemption, and of Justification by Faith in him, to all the World, both Jews and Gentiles (Ver. 24, 25, &c.) Now, what*

what can we suppose should give *Rise* to this so great and general Apostacy of Mankind, but the Corruption and Depravity of their very *Nature*, derived from apostate *Adam*?--- Again, the Apostle saith, *Gal. 3. 22. The Scripture* (i. e. the Doctrine of Scripture, or God in the Scripture) *bath concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.*----*ALL* (the Word in the Greek is neuter) i. e. all Nations and Conditions of Men; all Ages of Mankind, young, and old; all that is in Man, all his Powers, Faculties, and Actions; *all* are declared in the Word of God to be *under Sin*, i. e. *shut up* under it (so the Word signify's) as in a Prison, that they might despair of Relief from any other: Only this one Door of Escape is open'd to them; viz. *Faith of Jesus Christ*, who is set forth to them as the only and all-sufficient Saviour from Sin and Death.---Let me add that in *Luk. 19. 10. The Son of Man is come to seek, and to save that which was lost.*----Now, if any Man, or Number of Men, can be found, who were not *lost*, it will be granted, they are *none* of those whom Christ came to *seek* and *save*. But if *all* those who are *sought* and *saved* by Christ, were in a *lost*, ruin'd State, there is no Doubt but this is the unhappy Lot of all the rest of Mankind in their natural State. Yea, and if dying *Infants* are saved by *Christ*, it will follow, they were lost in *Adam*.

Thirdly, From such Texts as speak of Man's *Impotency*, in his natural State, unto all *spiritual Good*.---Men cannot know the Things of the Spirit, for want of a spiritual discerning. *1 Cor. 2. 14. The natural Man receiveth not the Things of the Spirit*---Neither can he know them, because they are *spiritually discerned*.---They cannot believe in Christ. *Joh. 5. 44. How can ye believe, who receive Honour one of another?* Which was not only true of the prejudiced *Jews*, but of every Man before the Illumination of Grace. *Joh. 6. 44. No Man can come to Me, except the Father which hath sent Me, draw him.*---They cannot speak that which is good. *Matth. 12. 34, &c. How can ye being evil, speak good Things!*---They cannot do what is acceptable to God. *Joh. 15. 5. Without Me, ye can do Nothing. Rom. 8. 8. They that are in the Flesh* (not only do not, but) *cannot please God. Ver. 7. Are not subject to the Law of God; neither indeed can be.* Does not all this proclaim the dreadful Degeneracy of the human Nature, in all it's Faculties?

Fourthly,

Fourthly, From those Characters the Scripture gives us of *natural Men*, that are quite opposite to the several Parts of the Image of God, in which Man was at first created, & which consisted in Knowledge in the Understanding, Righteousness and Holiness in the Will and Affections.--- But now, in Stead of Knowledge, there is Ignorance, Darkness, Blindness in the Mind, with respect to the Things of God. *Eph. 4. 18. Having the Understanding darkned, being alienated from the Life of God thro' the Ignorance that is in them, because of the Blindness of their Heart.* So in the forecited Text, *1 Cor. 2. 14. The natural Man* (in the highest Improvement of his natural Light and Abilities) *receiveth* (or knoweth) *not the Things of the Spirit of God* (not because of the want of an external Revelation, as in Heathenism; for it is added) *For they are Foolishness unto him* (which supposes the Revelation of them extant and known, so as to become the Object of his Contempt; but because of spiritual Blindness, as it follows) *neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*--- And in Stead of the Conformity of the Will to the Law of God in Holiness and Righteousness, there is in the *natural Man* a direct Opposition and Enmity. *Rom. 8. 7. The carnal Mind is Enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, &c.*

Fifthly, From those Texts that give us a Description of Believers as they were in their natural State, before a Change was wrot in them, by the Grace of God, in their Regeneration or Conversion. *Rom. 6. 17.---Ye were the Servants of Sin, &c. Tit. 3. 3, 4, 5. Foolish, Disobdient, &c. Eph. 2. 1, 2, 3. Dead in Trespasses and Sins; wherein ye walked, &c. Chap. 5. 8. Ye were sometimes Darkness, but now are Light in the Lord. Col. 1. 21.---Alienated, and Enemies in your Minds by wicked Works. Chap. 2. 13. And you being dead in your Sins, &c. See also Acts 26. 18. Col. 1. 13. and other Places.*--- If it be objected, These were Heathens, and some of the worst of Heathens, who had corrupted themselves by their actual Wickedness; and it is not fair, to make an Estimate of the Condition of all Men by Nature, especially of those who are born and educated in the Church of God, by such Patterns of Vice and Wickedness as those Heathens were: I reply, The Objection is vain. For had we been all left destitute of divine Revelation, with which God has bless'd his visible

Church; had we been debar'd of all *Education*, *Discipline*, or *Instruction* by Means of this *Revelation*; had we been cut off from all *Rays of Light* from Him who has stiled himself *the Light of the World*; which are the *Effects* of a voluntary and gracious *Dispensation*; then we had all been in the *Condition* of *Heathens*, yea, even of the vilest and worst of *Heathens*. *These* therefore are the *fittest* of all *Mankind* to be exhibited as a *Specimen* of what our *Condition* is by *Nature*. To be in *Darkness*, yea to be *Darkness* it self, to be under the *Power of Darkness*, under the *Power of Satan*, to be *dead in Sin*, *alienated from the Life of God*, --- is a *Description* of the *State* they were in from their *Birth*; and tho' they are also described partly from the actual *Wickedness* & *Degeneracy* of their *Lives*, yet this proves a *Degeneracy of Nature*; as the *Cause* is proved by the *Effect*, which has a natural and necessary *Connection* with it.

Sixthly, From those *Texts* that speak of the *Greatness of the Power*, requisite to work this *Change* on *Mankind*. 'Tis a *Power* that *raises the Dead*; which is nothing less than *divine Omnipotence*. In *Eph. 1. 19, 20.* the *Apostle* speaks of *The exceeding Greatness of God's Power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty Power, which he wrought in Christ, when he rais'd him from the Dead.* But wherein is this *mighty Power to us-ward manifested*? He tells you, *Chap. 2. 5. Even when we were dead in Sins, he hath quickned us together with Christ.* -- It is set forth as the *Product* of a *creating Power*. *Ver. 10. For we are his Workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good Works.* Hence every *Christian Convert* hath the *Character* given him of a *new Creature*. *2 Cor. 5. 17. If any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature.* Now, tho' these *Metaphors* are not to be strain'd to an *Excess*, yet so much at least is imply'd, that *Man's Nature* is so exceedingly *disordered* by *Sin*, and *degenerated* from the *State* of his first *Creation*, that he needs a new *creating Power* of *God*, which is put forth in *restoring* him to his *primitive Rectitude*; whereby he is, as it were, *created anew*, in the *Redeemer, Christ Jesus*. --- To which may be added the *Words* of *Christ*, declaring the *absolute Necessity of Regeneration*, to every one that is born of a *Woman*, *Joh. 3. 5, 6, 7.*

Seventhly, From those *Scripture-Terms*, by which our *Regeneration, & Sanctification* is express'd. When the *new Man*
(i. e.

(i. e. the Man in Christ, by Faith and Regeneration) is said to be *renewed in Knowledge, after the Image of him that created him*, Col. 3. 10. *Which after God is created in Righteousness and true Holiness*, Eph. 4. 24. This refers to the Creation of *Adam*. Gen. 1. 27. *God created Man in his own Image &c.* Tho' the Image of God in Man may be understood to denote several Things, as his *Dominion* over the Creatures, and his Resemblance of the *natural* Perfections of his Creator, being made an intelligent free Agent : Yet it can't rationally be denied, Resemblance of his *moral* Perfections, in spiritual Knowledge, Righteousness and Holiness, is in an eminent Sense the Image of God. And it is after *this* Image, Regenerate Believers are said to be *renewed*, in their Sanctification. And this Word, RENEWED, applied to the Image of God, plainly supposes Man in his first Estate, to have been possessed of this Image intire ; and that it is since lost or impaired, so as to need a Reparation by the *new-creating* Grace of the Redeemer. And this makes it necessary, to understand the Image of God, in which Man was at first created, eminently to intend his *moral* Image, in Divine Knowledge, Righteousness and Holiness ; for we are not *renewed* to a Resemblance of God in our natural Faculties : we are not *renewed* to a Dominion over the Creatures, unless as it is an Appendage of our Sanctification ; but we are *renewed* to a Resemblance of the moral Perfections of God. And this irrefragably proves *Original Righteousness* intended by the Image of God, in which *Adam* was created ; and the *Depravity* of human *Nature*, in Consequence of the Loss of this Image, till it be restored by the *Renewing of the Holy Ghost*.

Eighthly. From the Scripture-Doctrine of the *Sacraments* of *Regeneration*, Circumcision and Baptism, which were by divine Warrant to be applied unto *Infants*. See Gen. 17. 10. and Col. 2. 11, 12. And that this spiritual Grace, this Blessing of Regeneration, or Cleansing from moral Defilement, is the Thing signified in *both*, is evident, in that it is often denominated in Scripture from each of them, as the outward Signs. Deut. 30. 6. Rom. 2. 28, 29. Joh. 3. 5. Tit. 3. 5.

Ninthly, From such Texts as open to us the *Benefit* we have by *Christ*, as our Redeemer. For the Remedy sheweth our Malady. Here I am at a Loss, not thro' Scantiness of Matter, but thro' Abundance and Variety. Let that one Text suffice :

132 *A Summer-Morning's Conversation.*

suffice : 1 Cor. 1. 30. *You are in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Sanctification, and Redemption.* Now, does not this plainly tell us, we are naturally *destitute* of all these?---The Texts under these Heads of Scripture (and many more might be added) either directly prove, or by necessary Consequence infer, the Point under Consideration.

NEI. Those you have already alledg'd and illustrated, leave me fully convinced, that the Scripture is not so sparing in it's Testimonies to this Doctrine, as some pretend.

And now (Sir) I have nothing more to ask, but your Prayers for me. You have abundantly satisfied my Doubts, and eased me of all the Scruples I had to propose to you, relating to the foremention'd *Conversation*. I heartily thank you for this Labour of Love ; and pray God to reward it to you. I only crave Leave to communicate this Conference, that others may partake with me in the Benefit of it. And I am not without Hope, that my *two Neighbours* may, by Means hereof, be convinced, they were too hasty in paying their Compliments to the *Minister* ; or at least may think, the Matter well deserves a Reconsideration. However, it may be of Service for the Establishment of others, in these Times of the Prevalency of Error, and for *building them up* in this Part of our *most holy Faith*.

MIN. I heartily rejoyce, if I have been instrumental in conveying any Degree of Light, for scattering your Doubts and Scruples ; and been successful in clearing up this important Doctrine to your Satisfaction. I freely give my Consent to your communicating this Conference, as you shall see meet. And if what I have discoursed has been of any Service to you, or may be so to others, by the divine Blessing, for their Confirmation in Faith and Holiness, let God have all the Praise. AMEN.



E R R A T A.

Page 12. line 27. read *Parent*,---P. 18. l. 20. after, *eat*, add,
But of the Tree of Knowledge of Good & Evil thou shalt not eat.
 Ver. 16, 17.---P. 56. l. 29. r. *Way of*---P. 72. l. 3. fr. bottom,
 for *they*, r. *it*---P. 112. l. 6. from bottom, r. *this is*.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

AFTER the foregoing Piece was gone to the Press, there came to my Hand *A SUPPLEMENT* to the *Winter-Evening Conversation* (printed, it is said, at *New-Haven*) written by another Hand ; wherein the Writer (who is unnamed) does not expressly declare either his Approbation or Condemnation of that Treatise ; but leaves the Subject of it to the Examination and Judgment of the Reader : Yet, in the mean Time, he has given sufficient Evidence, that he falls in with, and, in the Main, approves the novel Opinions asserted and maintained therein, in Opposition to the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, commonly received. And the Design and Aim of this *Supplement* seems to be, partly to take off the *Surprise*, which he had good Reason to suppose, the Minds of People generally would be filled with, by “an Attack made upon Doctrines that they have been used to consider as sacred ;” withal recommending a free Inquiry and close Examination of the Doctrines we have long considered as founded on Truth and Revelation ; insinuating as if this Doctrine of *Original Sin*, as it has been taught in our Churches, were it brought under such Inquiry and Examination, would be no longer received as a *sound Doctrine* ; partly to declare his own Opinion of the *Nature* of *Original Sin*, what it is, and wherein it consists ; in explaining whereof the *Winter-Evening Conversation* seems to be very defective, and to need a *Supplement*. But as the *Supplemental* Writer, while opening his Mind on this Head, has, in Effect, granted the Substance of the Doctrine pleaded for, *viz.* The Derivation of a *disordered, depraved Nature*, from *Adam* ; though in explaining the *Modus*, or Means of its Conveyance to us, he goes out of the common Way, and has a Thought peculiar to himself, and different, I think, from the Truth of Holy Scripture ; and has granted, in Effect, if I understand him, the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*

Sin to his Children and Descendants, in (some, at least, of) the penal Effects of it, as he stood their Representative : And as his *Hypothesis* is built on a precarious Foundation, without any Warrant or Ground in Scripture, though proposed with an Air of Modesty ; I find no Inclination to enter into a Contest with him, about his *philosophical* Account of the Derivation of Original Sin, by the *Body* being infected and disordered with the *Poison* of the *forbidden Fruit*, and so infecting the *Soul*, and causing it to act irregularly. Nevertheless there are, in this *Supplement*, divers Things that deserve to be noted as exceptionable ; which shall be made evident in a few brief Remarks.

First, I observe, this Writer represents the Author of the *Winter-Evening Conversation*, as undertaking “ to prove, that “ the Doctrine of Original Sin, in that Sense of it which “ supposes Mankind properly deserving of, and liable “ to, everlasting Punishment for Adam’s Sin, has no Foundation in Scripture, or Reason,” &c.—This, I think, implies that there is some *other Sense*, in which the Doctrine may be maintained, consistently with Scripture and Reason. Whereas, in Fact, the said Author sets himself to oppose and run it down, in *whatsoever Sense* it has hitherto been taken by those that have treated of it. He allows *no other* Original Sin, but the first Transgression of our first Parents, their eating the forbidden Fruit. (*Winter-Evening Conversation*, Page 6.) He plainly denies *all* Derivation of Sin from Adam to his Posterity by natural Generation ; both the Imputation of his *Guilt*, and the Conveyance of a corrupted *Nature* to them. *That Sense* of it, in which it exposes Men to everlasting Punishment in a *future State*, is *no Sense* which is any Ways requisite to the Consideration of it. The Doctrine of *Original Sin* stands intire, without entering at all into that Question, —What the Consequences or penal Effects of it are *after Death*, and in *another World*, to any of Mankind ? and without coming to any Determination about it. Therefore it seems to be the Design of the said Author in stating his Question, which runs thus, *Whether we, and all Adam’s Posterity, are charged by God with his first Sin, so as that Men, Women, and Children, are exposed, by this alone, to the eternal Damnation of Hell ?* (I say, it seems to be the Design of the Question thus stated) to amuse simple undiscerning People ; and, in Stead of clearing the Truth, to entangle and perplex it the more, by *blending* together Things of a *different Nature* ;

or,

or, at least, to bring the true Doctrine of Original Sin, under a popular *Odium*, as if it were necessarily connected with the Idea of *eternal Damnation in Hell*; whereas these are two distinct and separate Questions (as I observed, *Summer-Morning Conversation*, Pag. 7, and 14.) The Question, Whether *Adam's Sin* (not as it was his personal Act, but in a moral Consideration, respecting the *Guilt*, as he was the *Head* of the whole Body of Mankind) is charged by God on all his Posterity? This, indeed, essentially belongs to the Doctrine of *Original Sin*; and 'tis held in the *Affirmative* by all that defend that Doctrine: But not so the other Question, which concerns the Punishment of *Adam's Sin* in a *future State*, and is this, Whether *all Men, Women, and Children*, are by that Sin *alone* exposed to the *eternal Damnation of Hell*? The former has no Manner of Dependence on the Resolution of this latter Question. If he had confined himself to this Question, and held closely to the *Negative*, I should not have been the Man that would have opposed him; and I am persuaded that few, or none else, would: For I can hardly believe, that ever any Man seriously *affirmed* this, (not even those who might hold *Adam's Sin* punishable in his Posterity, in a future State) *viz.* That *all Men, Women, and Children*, are exposed to that everlasting Punishment for *Adam's Sin alone*; since all those of *Adam's* Posterity, who have arrived to adult Age, are chargeable with actual personal Sins, more than enough to expose them to it, whether *Adam's Sin* be taken into the Account, or not. All the Doubt that remains (as I have shewn) is concerning such as *die in Infancy*, before they are capable of sinning after the Similitude of *Adam's Transgression*: Whether they are exposed to *eternal Punishment for his Sin*? As to this, I have freely declared my Mind in the foregoing *Conversation*. And as I have not asserted it, but left it among the *secret Things of God*: So, on the other Hand, since we know and see Multitudes of *Infants*, in the *righteous Judgment* of God, doomed, for *Adam's Offence*, to Pains and Death of the Body, which is their *eternal Death* as to this World, and would be *absolutely eternal*, were they never restored by the Redeemer; and since we see them lie under remaining Tokens of God's Wrath against the Sin of Man, by their continuing under the *Power of Death*, for the present, and under the Ignominy of the *Grave*: I should think him a bold Man, who would charge the Almighty with *Injustice*, if he should lay them under any Degree

Degree of Punishment, for that Offence, in a *future World*, (and we have no Revelation from God to the Contrary, except with Respect to the Children of godly Parents) for that would be directly to *blaspheme*.—But all this is foreign to the Point of *Original Sin*. However, 'tis true indeed, it is in *this Sense* and with this View, by raising a Clamour about the Horridness of the *eternal Damnation of Infants*, that the aforesaid Author carries on his Opposition to the Whole of this Doctrine.

The *Supplement-Writer* goes on, and being aware that the Tenets of the forementioned *Winter-Evening Conversation* will not readily go down with great Numbers of sober thinking People, who have been long otherwise taught from the Word of God, and who will be apt to be startled at such *novel and strange Doctrine*, he endeavours to allay their Fears, by shewing there is *no Danger* of any Prejudice to *Religion or Truth*, by Disputes and Inquiries into received Principles, and Doctrines established by long Use: And to this End he has much to say in Commendation of *free Inquiry* into religious Truth: — “The more it is tried, the more its Strength appears, and its Brightness shines. — If free Inquiry is but permitted, the Cause of Truth must necessarily prevail. — To the Suppression of free Inquiry is owing the Prevalence of *Popish Superstition and Errors*.” — Be it so: But then, on the other Hand, What if an *unbounded Liberty* of Inquiry should lead Men to *Licentiousness* of Opinion in religious Matters, and not suffer them to *fix* in any one Article of Faith? What if it should lead some Men back to the Errors of *Papery*, particularly in this Article of *Original Sin*? What if their *free Thinking*, or free Inquiry should lead them to apprehend this to be *no Sin, properly*, but only an Infirmary, a *Languor*, a Disease, or *Disorder* of Nature; and that it is rather the *Punishment* of Sin, than a *Sin*; and that if it be a Sin, it is the *lightest* of all Sins; and that *Concupiscence* (or the Motions of *Lust* in the Heart, the immediate Issue of natural Corruption) if not consented to by the Will, is *no Sin*; especially after *Baptism*! — Which are exactly the Tenets of the *Popish* Doctors, * and which were wont to be witnessed against as *Popish* Errors, contrary to the sound Words of Scripture, by all *Protestant* Divines, who made use of *free Inquiry*, in Times when it was permitted to but very few.
If

* *Vid. Rivet. contra Bail. Jesuitam. Tom. 2. Tract. 4. Quæst. 14.*

If such Things as these, I say, are the Effects of an unlimited Freedom of Inquiry, what are they better than those that follow on the *Suppression* of free Inquiry? However, I readily and fully agree with this Writer, in recommending a (well-regulated) *free Inquiry*, and impartial Examination of the Doctrines of Religion; which Liberty is the undoubted Right of every Christian; and not only so, but I judge it his Duty strictly to examine the Grounds of every Article of his Creed, that he may be able to *render a Reason* of the Faith and *Hope that is in him*: And am as much against an *implicit* Belief of religious Doctrines, as this Writer himself; and can assure him, I have no Fear at all of the Consequences of the most *rigid* Inquiry into the Doctrine now in Debate, provided the *Sacred Scriptures* be made the Standard of such Inquiry, and not mere human Schemes and Fancies; and also that it be managed with Modesty, Equity, and Fairness. But it is a quite different Thing from this, for Men to make an open and confident Attack upon Principles or Doctrines received among a Christian People, after the most strict and impartial Examination, and run them down with Obloquy and Invective, with Banter and Ridicule, with contemptuous and opprobrious Language, exclaiming against them as absurd, — *absurd as Transubstantiation, unworthy of God, contrary to his Perfections*, and even blasphemous; and against the Abettors of them, as *infatuated with Prejudice*, &c. Such a Sort of Management, I think, neither the Rules of Religion, nor of Good Manners, will permit. When we have once carefully and strictly *examined*, and thereupon solemnly *fixed* our religious Sentiments in any fundamental Point of Christian Doctrine, why must we be called upon to *re-examine*, or inquire over again, upon the rising up of every bold Objector? For though I am persuaded, Truth stands *safe*, notwithstanding all the Contradictions and Cavils of its Adversaries, yet to be *always inquiring* into Foundation-Principles, may be of dangerous Consequence to many Souls, especially the less discerning and judicious, that compose the Bulk of Mankind, who are thereby in Danger of *never coming to the Knowledge of the Truth*, or being settled in the *Belief* of it; but of being tempted to *Scepticism* and *Irreligion*; to *doubt* of every Thing which they have been taught, though from the Scriptures; and, at last, of the Scriptures themselves. Whoever considers Fact and Experiment, or the Temper of Mankind in general, must acknowledge this to be the Case; and no *wise* Man will think him, on that Account,

count, liable to the Censure of being "very weak, or very ignorant, or very wicked."

As to the Doctrine itself in Controversy, this *Supplemental* Writer sees fit to caution us against *Prejudice* in reading the *Arguments against it*. We accept the Caution, as it is always proper in such Inquiries, and needful for the Investigation of Truth: Yet, I hope, he will pardon me, if I suggest, that the *Caution* more properly belongs to them that *give* it; I mean, to those who are on the other Side of the Question, and *oppose* this Doctrine; for such have the *Pride* and *Prejudice of human Nature* intirely on their Side, which cannot very patiently bear a *Doctrine* so *humbling* and *mortifying* to it, as this of *Original Guilt* and *Corruption*, that has befallen it; and therefore they, of all Men, have greatest Need to stand on their Guard against *Prejudice* in reading and considering the Arguments *for* it. Whereas, natural *Self-Love*, which inclines us to pass the most favourable Judgment on ourselves, would prompt us readily to fall in with the Opinion of those who reject it, as being most agreeable to the Guilt of human Nature, if it carried with it any force of Argument to convince or persuade.

I come now to take a brief View of the *Supplemental* Writer's peculiar Opinion concerning *Original Sin*; which he thinks is not inconsistent with the Doctrine delivered in the *Winter-Evening Conversation*; — wherein, I apprehend, he is much mistaken, as I shall shew afterwards.

His Conception of this Matter, in Sum, is this, as far as I understand it: — The Fruit of the *forbidden Tree*, which God commanded the Man not to eat of, (which Prohibition He gave him, for the Trial of his Obedience) was of a *poisonous* Nature; and *Adam's* Body being infected and impaired thereby, the *Venom* diffused itself to all his *Posterity* by natural Generation: All human *Bodies*, springing from him in his Likeness, are impaired and disordered by the mortal *Poison* of the forbidden Fruit; and the *Body* being the Instrument of the *Soul's* Actions, when it comes to be united to it, the *Soul* partakes of the unhappy Infection and Disorder of the *Body*, and is disposed by it to act irregularly, i. e. *to sin*. "This original Disorder of the *Body* inclining the *Soul* "to Evil," is what he understands by *Original Sin*, or *Corruption*. — But this Disorder in the *Body*, and in the *Soul* through the Influence of the *Body*, is *no Sin*, properly so called; not in the *Body*, which is of itself originally senseless

less, and inactive; not in the *Soul* before it begins to act freely, and of Choice; yet Men commit *actual Sins* through an *original Disorder* in their *Nature*. — And in *this Sense* original Sin is true. — “And as *Adam* was the Representative for “the *bodily Part* of the human *Nature*, — and as he by “his *Action*, as *such a Representative* for his *Posterity*, incurred the threatened Penalty, which was *Death*, — he thereby “involved all his *Posterity* in the same.” (*Supplement*, P. 2, 3, 4.) This may to some appear a singular Fancy, and *new*; and it is so in some Respects: But as to the deadly natural Infection, derived to *Adam* and his *Posterity*, from the *poisonous Quality* of the *forbidden Fruit*, it is a Notion that has been vented long ago; and I have admitted it for Argument or Illustration Sake, and have said what I thought proper in Relation to it (*Summer-Morning's Conversation*, P. 48.) but have been far from adopting it, as a true and solid Sentiment. I shall here but briefly note a few Things in Reference hereto.

1. That his *whole Scheme* is built on this *precarious Supposition*, viz. That the *forbidden Fruit* had a *natural Poison* in it, to cause all the *Distempers* of human *Nature*, and its Dissolution by *Death*. A Notion which has no Foundation in Scripture, or Reason. None, I presume, will pretend to found it in *Scripture*: There is not one Text, that I have observed, which has the least Glance that Way. Nor is there any *rational Probability* of it. It is not at all probable, there was any more *natural Evil* in the Fruit of the *Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil*, than in the Fruit of any other Tree in the Garden: Nor is it likely that, when it is said, *God made all Things very good*, he should have planted in *Paradise* a Tree of so *evil* and *noxious* a Quality to Mankind, as that it should be necessary to guard them against it by a positive Precept. Neither, on this Supposition, would the Command given to *Adam*, to abstain from the Fruit of this Tree, have been so proper a *Test* of his Obedience to his Creator: We reasonably presume such a Command to be purely *positive*; a Signification of the *sovereign Will* of the Creator, that had no other Reason, or Obligation to the Observance of it, than merely the Will and Pleasure of the Law-giver. But, in the Case supposed, this Command appears founded on the *Reason* and *Necessity* of the Thing; and not purely on the Will of the Creator: For it was necessary, from the Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness of God, that his innocent Creature, Man, should be warned of the *malignant Nature* and Effects of the Fruit
of

of that *Tree*, lest he should take his *Death*, in the Enjoyment of the Delights of *Paradise*; and therefore were this Supposition admitted, we could not certainly conclude, that *Adam* was put upon any Trial of his Obedience to his Creator by that Command: For the Reason of the Thing required, that this *Fruit* should be prohibited to him, and that he should be cautioned against meddling with it, from the paternal Goodness of his Creator, purely out of Regard to his Safety and Welfare. Such probable Reasons there are, that lie against this Notion; and no solid Reason, to support it. Therefore I might dismiss all his Arguings from it, as depending on a groundless Figment: But I go on to say,

2. 'Tis easy to conceive how the *Poison* of the forbidden Fruit (were the Thing true) might by a natural Operation infect the *Body* of *Adam*; and also how this mortal *Poison* might be propagated, by natural Generation, to the *Bodies* of his Posterity; but it is unaccountable to me, how an infected and disordered Body should communicate its Infection to a *Spirit*, coming into it pure and unblemished, so as to dispose it to *disorderly*, that is, *sinful* Actions. We know, that these Souls of ours, which we suppose fallen from their original Purity and Rectitude, through the first Man's Apostacy, and consequently thereupon immersed (as it were) in Flesh and Sense, are greatly influenced and governed by the *bodily* Senses, Lusts, and Appetites: But we are at a Loss how to conceive a *Soul*, originally pure, to be tainted or disordered by the *Body*. He tells us, "The *Body* is the only Instrument by which the *Soul* acts, or exerts any of its Powers in this World." Yet he does not tell us *how* that *Body* acts upon the *Soul*, so as to *corrupt* its Powers, and put its Frame into Disorder. The *Similitude* he makes Use of, does not enlighten us; which is that of "an *Artist* performing his Work *ill*, or *well*," according to "the Order of his *Tools*." But surely the *Workman* is not to be *blamed*, if he performs his Work ill, merely because he has bad *Tools* to work by; nor is his Art or Skill at all impaired, by the Badness of his *Tools*. The same may be observed of a *Musician*, which is his other *Similitude*. So neither is the *Soul* to be *blamed* for any of its Acts, in which it depends on the *bodily* Organs, if those Acts be defective, or irregular, meerly through *bodily* Disorders; nor does the *Soul* contract any *Guilt*, or moral *Defilement*, by a sickly, distempered *Body*, though it shares in its Grievs and Pains. He says, "it is in a *mysterious* Manner," that the Con-

dition

dition of the Body influences the Affections of the Soul; and I am content it should pass for a *Mystery*. Our Blessed Saviour took our Nature, with all its sinless Infirmities; he *partook of the same Flesh and Blood* with us (*Heb. ii. 14.*) and was in *all Things made like unto his Brethren* (*Verse 17*) and subject to all the innocent Frailties of the human Body; Hunger, Thirst, Weariness, &c. Yet he was *that Holy Thing* born of the Virgin. (*Luke i. 35.*) His holy Soul derived no moral Contagion or Disorder, by being united to a Body of Flesh, like ours. — Will it be said, There was a particular Kind of *Poison* transmitted from *Adam* to all the Rest of his Children, from which the holy Child, *Jesus*, was by a special Privilege exempted? This is, indeed, the Truth of the Case: And that particular *Poison* was Nothing but *Sin*; the Poison was not in the forbidden *Fruit*, but in the *eating* of it, in Disobedience to the Command of God. This first Transgression of our first Parents was that *alone* which has diffused a mortal *Venom* through their whole Race.

3. Setting aside the particular Mode or Means of the Derivation of Sin and Defilement from *Adam*, this Writer confesses the Substance of the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, both *inherent* and *imputed*, as it is held by those who are called *Calvinists*. For, according to the Scheme he presents to us, there is certainly a *Lapse* of human Nature from its *primitive State*; and what that State was, both Reason and Scripture dictate, *viz.* a State of Integrity, Holiness, and Righteousness, in which Man resembled his Maker, and which was the Crown and Glory of the human Nature; from which, it is evident, there is now a deplorable Defection in the Nature and State of Man.

1. As to *Original Sin inherent*, he owns, that the *Body* being *originally disordered*, the *Soul* united to it is hereupon *inclined to Evil*, and contracts such Dispositions and *Propensities to disorderly, and therefore evil, Actions*, as that the *supernatural Assistance* of divine Grace is necessary, to set him free to do good; — “so that the Actions springing from such a “Creature, could never be *pleasing* to a God of infinite Purity and Holiness.” — Which is agreeable to the Apostle’s Doctrine of the corrupt disordered Nature of Man, *Rom. viii. 7, 8.* *The carnal Mind is Enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the Flesh, cannot please God.* — This, as to the *positive Part* of *Original Sin inherent*, is the utmost (for aught I know)

I know) that the most rigid *Calvinists* insist upon. Only there is one Thing he has not mentioned, in which, I apprehend, the formal Reason of the *Soul's* Disorder and evil Inclination consists; and that is the *Loss* of its *original Rectitude*, or the *Image of God*, in which Man was at first created. Hence it is, that all the Irregularities and Disorders of the human Nature ensue: And hence it is, that the *Soul* is so enslaved to the *Flesh*, and the corrupt Lusts and Inclinations of it, that it has no *free* Power to do *Good*, or any Thing *pleasing to God*, till it be restored, and set at Liberty, by *supernatural* Grace. 'Tis true, he denies this original Disorder and Depravity to be properly *Sin*; but this shall be enquired into under a following Head. And then,

2. As to Original Sin *imputed*, This he (at least implicitly) acknowledges, when he confesses, that *Adam* was "such a *Representative* for his Posterity," as that "by his Action" in eating the forbidden Fruit, having himself "incurred the threatened Penalty, which was *Death*, he thereby involved "all his Posterity in the same" Penalty. What is this but to own, that the *Guilt* of *Adam's* first Transgression is charged upon all his *Posterity*, in the penal Effects of it; and this by Virtue of his being their *Representative*? For, if the Penalty of his Action in transgressing the Command of God, were *Death*, and this Penalty of *Death* be transferred on all his Posterity, by Virtue of his being their Representative; as he says, *he thereby involved all his Posterity in the same* Penalty, which he incurred by his Act of Disobedience; then the *Guilt* of his Transgression must necessarily be *imputed* to them: For a Penalty always supposes *Guilt*, and has a necessary Relation to it in its own Nature; *Guilt* is ever presupposed, in the common Sense and Estimate of Mankind, in all proper *Punishment*; yea, the *Infliction* of a Penalty is, in Fact and Reality, an *Imputation* of the *Guilt* that incurred it. This is a Demonstration, that *Adam's* first Sin is imputed to his Posterity, because they are all involved in the Punishment incurred thereby.—I may also add, those Disorders of the *bodily* Constitution, which he supposes as the Cause of those Disorders and evil Inclinations of the *Soul*, before mentioned, arising from the Infection of the *mortal Poison* of the forbidden Fruit, are to be considered as the *penal* Effects of *Adam's* Transgression in eating thereof: For these Effects of that poisonous Fruit, this Gentleman allows to be the *Punishment* of *Adam's* Failure. (*Supplement*, P. 3.) If it were so in his

own Person, he being the *Representative* of his *Posterity*, it must consequently be the Punishment of his Failure in *them* too. So, the Disorders and Depravations of the human Soul, supposing they spring immediately from an *original Disorder in the human Body*, are a plain Proof of original Guilt ; which this Writer thinks a Mistake. (*Supplement*, P. 4.) Whereas, if the proper Effect be a Proof of the Cause, this must needs follow.

But I am to take Notice of a singular and odd Conceit in this Writer, *viz.* that "*Adam* was the Representative for "the *bodily* Part of the human Nature." (*ibid.*) This, I confess, is new and unheard of : A *Representative* of *Bodies* ! Doubtless, if *Adam* were a Representative at all, he was so of the whole *Persons* of his *Posterity*. It may be asked, Did not *Adam* represent that *Nature* which he propagated ? This cannot fairly be denied. And then, Did not that *Nature* consist of an human *Body* and a reasonable *Soul* ? If not, then he did not propagate his *Nature*, as all other Creatures did, which were made for propagating their Species : For an human *Body*, abstractedly considered, is no more the Nature of Man, than the Body of a *Brute*. That which led this Writer into such a Conceit as this, was, I imagine, an Opinion he had espoused, that *Adam's* *Posterity* derive only their *Bodies* from him. "*So much* of human *Nature*," he says, "as his "*Posterity* could receive from him." (*ibid.*) But this is undoubtedly a Mistake. Does not *Man* beget *Man*, in Soul as well as Body, like himself ? Is not a *Son* the Name of an human *Person* ? And does not an human Person consist of *Body* and *Soul* united ? How then can he that begets a *Son*, be said to be the Parent of his *Body* only ? 'Tis true, earthly Parents are stiled the *Fathers of our Flesh* (*Heb. xii. 9.*) *i. e.* by Way of Eminence, because we derive our Nature from them by carnal Generation ; but it is *Flesh* animated with a living and reasonable *Soul* : As God is also stiled the *Father of Spirits*, not exclusively to our *Bodies* ; for he is the Former of them also.—But to come nearer the Case in Hand : Of *Adam* we read, *Gen. v. 3.* That he begat a *Son* in his own Likeness, after his Image, &c. If *Adam* begat in his own Likeness, then before, what he begat was a true human Person, consisting of Body and Soul. This *Image* and Likeness of *Adam* was not in his Body only, nor chiefly ; nor in his Soul only, tho' chiefly : But in his whole *Person*, Body and Soul in Conjunction, and both corrupted by Sin. — Be it granted, that the *Soul* is more immediately

mediately from God ; yet it is produced in the Course of natural Generation, according to the Law of Propagation, established in the Beginning ; as I have shewed elsewhere. (*Summer-Morning's Conversation*, P. 36, 44, 83.) Another Reason, as I suppose, why he fixed on this Notion of *Adam's* representing only the *bodily* Part of human Nature, might be, lest by considering him as the *Representative* of his Race, he should suggest any Thing that might infer the Conveyance or Imputation of his *Sin* to them, of which the *Soul* is the proper Subject ; or the *Soul's* Obnoxiousness to Sufferings for his Sin. *Both* which, however, do plainly and inevitably follow from the *Concessions* he has already made ; while he acknowledges the irregular Disposition and Inclination of the *Soul* to Sin, through the Influence of the *Body*, originally disordered, as deriving from *Adam* the immediate Effect of that criminal Action of his, in eating the *poisonous* Fruit prohibited ; whose Crime was *his Punishment*, left on himself and his Posterity. Hence it is undeniable, that the corrupt, depraved, and disordered Nature of the *Soul* is really (though mediately, according to his Scheme, by Means of the *Body*) derived from the Sin of *Adam*. And 'tis enough that he grants, *Adam* was *so far* our Representative, as to *involve us all* in the same Penalty of *Death*, which he incurred by his Transgression. *Bodily* Death, he means ; in which yet the *Body* is not the only Sufferer, but the *Soul* also, in Way of Sympathy with the animal Nature, being in itself also subject to great Agonies and Terrors. — The foregoing Reflections may serve to convince this Writer of his Mistake, in supposing the Doctrine of the Author of the *Winter-Evening Conversation* to be consistent with his Sense or Opinion of *Original Sin*, as it is here laid down. For it is evident, that Author *denies all Derivation* of Sin from *Adam* to his Posterity ; does not acknowledge him to be their *Representative*, in any Sense whatsoever ; and, by denying the *Imputation* of his Sin to them, does in Effect deny them to be liable to the *Penalty* of his Transgression. This, I say, is evident from the whole Tenor of his Disputation. How can they be intirely *innocent*, — as *innocent as can be* (so that Author asserts, and takes God to witness to it, *Winter-Evening Conversation*, Page 28.) who are *born* under such *Disorders* of Mind, as well as *Body*, and such Inclinations to *Evil*, that they *will certainly act amiss*, without *supernatural Grace*, as soon as capable of moral Action ? — All that I can think of, which may be said by this

this Writer in Defence of his Supposition, is, that he denies this original Disorder and Depravation of human Nature to be properly *Sin*. But this I am next to examine into, and shall prove him to be herein mistaken also. — In the mean Time, let me observe concerning this whole *Hypothesis*, that it seems calculated for reconciling the Minds of Men to the Doctrine of the Derivation of Sin and Death from *Adam* to his Posterity (which is a Doctrine too plainly delivered in Scripture, to be denied by any honest unprejudiced Mind) *without* regarding the primitive *Constitution* of an al-wise, holy, and righteous God, and *without* making themselves uneasy with Reflections on the *Justice* of God, in governing and dispensing the Effects of Man's first Apostacy and Breach of Covenant, according to his righteous Constitution, *by resolving all* into the meer Course of *natural Causes*, and the natural Operation of the *Poison* of the forbidden *Fruit*; so that every one may say, *This is an Evil, and I must bear it*, whether there be a God in the World, or not. — But, indeed, the *Justice* of God may as fairly be vindicated, in dispensing the *penal* Effects of the first Transgression to the Offspring of fallen *Adam*, as if they had been the natural Effects of a mortal Infection from the Fruit of the forbidden Tree. As I shewed in the foregoing *Conversation*. (P. 48, 115.)

4. I have observed, though this *supplemental* Writer owns what we call *original Corruption*, or *Depravity of Nature*, yet he disowns it to be *Sin*, properly speaking. I come now, therefore, to inquire into this Point, Whether that *Corruption of Nature*, that *Inclination of the Soul to Evil*, which we brought with us into the World from our Conception and Birth, be not properly *Sin*? And shall endeavour to prove the *Affirmative*. The Reason why this Writer denies the said original Corruption or Disorder to be *Sin*, he does not expressly declare; but suggests it to be because it proceeds not from the actual Choice, or Consent of the *Will*. He tells us, tho' "Man sins through an *original Disorder* in his Nature," yet "he has *no Sin*, neither in his *Body* nor *Mind*, till he begins "to act *freely* and *designedly*." (*Supplement*, Pag. 3, and 4.) To this it may be replied,

1. That if the *Consent* of the *Will* be requisite to constitute *Sin*, this is not totally wanting to that which we call *Original Sin*. This was voluntary in its originating Principle; *viz.* in *Adam*, our Head and Representative, *in whom we all sinned*. And I know not why that *Axiom* in Divinity should not hold good,

good, *Voluntas capitis, totius naturæ voluntas reputatur.* — Adam's Will, he being our common Head, was the Will of the whole human Nature; and in that Capacity, reputed the Will of every Individual of Mankind. — Till Children come to such Maturity as to have Wills of their own, their Parents Will is allowed to supply the Room of theirs, in Civil Transactions, and in Sacred too. And till Adam's Children have Wills of their own, his Will, by the same Equity, should stand for theirs. Perhaps it will be said, This Reply may be admitted, with Respect to Adam's Sin imputed; but how does it answer for inherent Corruption, or the Defilement of our Nature, derived from fallen Adam? How is this voluntary? I answer thus; It was voluntarily contracted by our first Parents, and is hereditary to us. But if this does not seem satisfactory, then I reply,

2. It is not the Will of Man, but the Law of God, which is the Rule or Measure, whereby we must judge of Sin or Holiness, according as the Thing judged of, is disagreeable or conformable thereunto, whether it be designed and voluntary, or not. — 'Tis true, as to actual Sin, the Concurrence or Consent of the Will is necessary; that it should be a chosen, voluntary act: Yet this is not essential to the Nature of Sin; otherwise the first Motions of Lust in the Heart, antecedent to the Consent of the Will, are no Sins: But to say this, is to take up a Popish Error, which Protestant Divines have exploded. And as free Inquiry has taught us to cast off Popish Superstition and Errors, so I hope, no pretended free Inquiry will lead any Man to take them up again, or return to any of them. We profess to make the Scriptures our Rule; and if we take them for the Rule and Standard of our Inquiries into this Matter, rather than the Maxims of Pagan Theology, we must judge, that it is not the being voluntary or involuntary, that makes a Thing sinful, or not sinful; but the being opposite to the Rule of God's Law; which requires a perfect Conformity, both of the Faculties and Actions; and every Defect of this Conformity is Sin. And hence it may be made to appear, that the native Corruption, Disorder, or Defilement inherent in the Soul, even before we are capable of committing actual Sin, or begin to act freely and designedly, is Sin; which I shall thus prove:

1. The Definition of Sin, in Scripture, agrees to this original Corruption. 1 Job. 3. 4. Sin is the Transgression of the Law. 'Tis one Word in the Original, ANOMIA; that is

to

to say (being interpreted, and expressed by one Word) an *Illegality*; which signifies as well a *Want of Conformity* to the Law, as a *Transgression* of it. And it is evident, there is in our depraved *Nature* a *Want of Conformity* to the holy Law of God; yea, not only *Anomia*, but *Antinomia*, a Principle of Contrariety and Enmity to it. *Rom. viii. 7. The carnal Mind* (and not only the carnal Practice) *is Enmity against God: For it is not subject to the Law of God, &c.* Now, since the Law of God is the Rule, by which we are to judge what is *Sin*, and what is *Holiness*, according to the Agreement, or Disagreement, of Things therewith; and since his Law requires, not only the Conformity of the outward Man in Acts of Obedience, but also an inward Conformity of the Faculties and Affections of the Soul, even an holy *Heart* and *Nature*; for *the Law is spiritual* (*Rom. vii. 14.*) obliging us to serve and obey God from internal Principles of Righteousness and true Holiness; to *love the Lord with all our Heart, Soul, Mind, and Strength* (as required, *Mark xii. 30.*) i. e. with all our inward Powers, and to the Height of our moral Capacities; if the Want of these holy Principles, and of that spiritual Perfection which the Law requires, be *Sin* properly, as it most certainly is, according to the inspired Apostle's Definition of it; then is the original Corruption and Disorder of our *Nature* properly *sinful*, as it disagrees to the Law of God, yea, is repugnant to it, and to those Principles of Holiness, and spiritual Perfection, which it requires.

2. This is often expressly termed *Sin* in Scripture, particularly in that noted Text, *Psaln li. 5. Behold, I was shapen in Iniquity; and in Sin did my Mother conceive me.* Here are two Words used, *Iniquity* and *Sin*; both which do undeniably, in Scripture-Use, denote *Sin*, in a proper Sense: And we ought not to depart from the proper Interpretation of Words, unless compelled by some weighty Reason. If therefore Words can signify any Thing, here is plain Proof.—Again, *Rom. v. 12. By one Man Sin entered into the World.* This is most properly to be understood of the *Sin* of the whole human Nature (not exclusive of actual Sins, issuing from it) which had its Entrance into the World by *Adam's Transgression*. So *Vers 19. By one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners.* Not only made Sufferers, but *Sinners*; not only by having his *Sin* charged upon them, as the Cause of Sufferings and Death, but also by having a *sinful Nature*, a Principle of *Sin*, derived from him and dwelling in them, from their Birth. And what is that *Body of Sin*, which is supposed to reign in the Unregenerate (*Rom.*

(Rom. vi. 6.) but a vicious corrupt *Nature*? Whether it proceed from a *Body* originally disordered, or otherwise, it is a *Body of Sin*. And in the seventh Chapter, the Apostle several Times calls it *Sin*. Verse 20th. *Sin that dwelleth in me*. This cannot mean actual Sin; for that is transient; but original Corruption, which is an *indwelling Sin*, and of which there are Remnants in the Regenerate. And hence we see, likewise, that it is not unusual in Scripture, to call that by the Name of *Sin*, which has not the full Consent of the Will; for such was the *Sin* which *Paul* speaks of as dwelling in him. *If I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but Sin that dwelleth in me*. He speaks not of *outward Acts* of Sin against the moral Law, but of *inward Motions*, and Workings of the corrupt *Affections*, that prevent the Acts of the Will; which are the immediate Effects of indwelling Sin. 'Tis also called *the Law of Sin*. (Ver. 23, 25.) What can this be but a powerful Principle in the Heart of Man, as corrupt, prompting him to sin. And 'tis observable, that the Apostle (Ver. 7) proves *Lust* to be properly *Sin* against the Law of God. *I had not known Sin* (saith he) *but by the Law*: And he proves it by this Instance, *For I had not known Lust* (to be *Sin*) *except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet*. Therefore *Lust* is *Sin*; else there is no Consequence in the Apostle's Argument. Now *Lust* is a Scripture-Term, not only for the Streams of actual evil Appetites and Passions, but for the Fountain of all evil Imaginations and Affections in a corrupt *Heart*: And so it is to be understood here; because it cannot reasonably be supposed, *Paul* was ignorant, that the *acting* of *Lust* was *Sin*, without being taught by that Precept of the Law: For this many *Heathens* have observed, as a Thing criminal and vitious, by the Light of Nature. But he means that inward *Propensity* in the corrupt Heart to vitious Acts, and the Motions and Tendencies of it to Evil, which are previous to the Consent of the Will. Therefore the Argument, to prove, that *Lust* is *no Sin*, unless the Will consent to it, from those Words of the Apostle, *Jam. i. 14. Lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth Sin*, — is inconclusive, and vain. For the Apostle *Paul* plainly tells us, that *Lust itself* is *Sin*, condemned by the Law of God. — And doth *Lust* bring forth *Sin*? Is it the Parent of so foul an Offspring? Certainly then it must itself have the Nature of *Sin*; yea, *Lust* is more sinful than any one actual *Sin*, as it is the abounding Fountain of all.

3. That which subjects us to the *Displeasure* of God, and to *Death*, as the Punishment of *Sin*, is truly and properly *Sin*. For God is angry with Nothing but *Sin*; he inflicts Punishment on none but *Sinners*. Now this original Depravity, this Defect of Righteousness,

Righteousness, and consequent Disorder in our Nature, is that which renders every Child of *Adam* obnoxious to the *Wrath of God*. Eph. ii. 3. *And were by Nature Children of Wrath, even as others.* Being the *Seed of Evil-doers*, and having in our *Nature* the *Seed of all Iniquity*, we are on that Account, and on that only, justly liable to divine *Wrath*. This Sense of the Text has been vindicated. (*Sum. Morn. Conv. P. 91, &c.*) And as the Effect and Token of this *Wrath*, *Death* is inflicted even on *Infants*; who have never actually sinned, and can have no Sin at all, if their *Nature* be not infected with Sin. And yet *Death* is constantly assigned as the *Penalty* of Sin. Rom. v. 12. and vi. 23. And it seems not to consist with the *Justice* of God, to inflict *Death* as a *Penalty* on a perfectly *innocent* and *unblemished* Nature. As to the *Death* of the most innocent and holy Son of God, this was a far different Case; founded on a voluntary Agreement and Condescension on the Son's Part, for his own and his Father's Glory, as well as for our Salvation. *Death* therefore, which by the righteous Providence of God befalls *Infants*, proves them to be not without Sin.

4. *Baptism*, which by the Rule of the New Covenant is to be administered to *Infants*, is a Proof of the Sinfulness of their *Nature*. For *Baptism* is given for *Remission of Sin*; not of actual Sin in *Infants*; for they have none: therefore for the Sin of their *Nature*.

5. The absolute *Necessity* of *Regeneration*, to every one that is born of a Woman, proves our hereditary Corruption to have the *Nature of Sin*. For that which excludes from the Favour of God, and the heavenly Happiness, and that makes *Regeneration* necessary, is truly and properly *Sin*, and only *Sin*. But this Carnality of our *Nature*, and the Corruption in which we were born, excludes from the Kingdom of Heaven; for which Cause our Saviour insists on the *Necessity* of the New Birth. Job. iii. 3, 6. — And *Regeneration* itself supposes a sinful Defilement of *Nature*, which is washed away therein. Hence 'tis called the *Washing of Regeneration*. Tit. iii. 5.

6. If *Infants*, dying, need Christ to *save* them, and are saved by him, then they have in their corrupted *Nature* that which is properly *Sin*; for those whom Christ *saveth*, he *saveth from their Sins*. Matth. i. 21. *Them he sanctifies and cleanses by his Blood.* Eph. v. 25, 26. — Either then we must say, that no *Infants* are saved by Christ, but all are lost and perish eternally; which yet is not to be reconciled to the *Justice* of God; without supposing them to have *Sin*, properly meriting Ruin: or, that they are of the *People of Christ*, whom he came to *save from their Sins*; belonging to that Body, of which he is the Head and Saviour. And

if so, then they have *Sin*, from which they need to be cleansed and saved.

7. If our Saviour, *Christ*, was, by a peculiar Privilege, *born without Sin*, then all others are *born in Sin*. He is called *that holy Thing*, which should be *born* of the Virgin (*Luke i. 35*) in Way of Eminence and Distinction from the Rest of Mankind, who are *born unclean* (*Job xiv. 4. and xxv. 4.*) being polluted with *Sin* from their Conception and Birth. Now, as it was a true and proper *Holiness*, in which *Christ* was born, in Opposition to original *Sin*, it follows, that the Pollution of Nature in others, is properly *Sin*.—From this and the foregoing Arguments, I think it abundantly clear and evident, that what we call *original Corruption* and *Depravity*, hath the true and proper Nature of *Sin*. And, perhaps, this Writer himself, upon second Thoughts, may be convinced, that such Depravation, and Disorder, and Inclination to Evil, as he acknowledges to be in human Nature originally (which Way soever it came by it) may be (in rational Beings, whose Powers and Principles, as well as outward Practices, fall under the Direction and Obligation of the divine *Law*) not improperly called *Sin*.—I come now to remark,

5. There is another Passage in this Writer, that requires some Correction, which occurs in the Close of his *Supplement*, though he had glanced at it more than once before. In giving the Sum of his Opinion concerning *Original Sin*, having observed, “It is “an original *Disorder* in the Body, derived from *Adam’s* Transgression,” he thus expresses himself, “Which disordered Body “inclines our Minds to Evil, and would destroy our *Freedom* to do “Good, or comply with the Conditions of Salvation, if it were “not for the *supernatural Aids* of the Blessed Spirit bestowed upon “all Mankind, to raise them to the *Freedom of Choice*, in which “*Adam* was placed.”—Here are two Things, which I look upon as very exceptionable. 1. That the *supernatural Aids of the Spirit* are bestowed on all Mankind, that they might be free to do Good, or comply with the Conditions of Salvation. 2. That this supernatural Grace of the Spirit is bestowed on all Men, in order to raise them to that *Freedom of Choice*, in which *Adam* was placed.—Neither of which Propositions have the least Foundation in Reason, or Scripture. Yet as they lead to new Controversies respecting universal Grace, and the Power of Man’s free Will, and the like, I shall wholly waive the Discussion of them. Only I will observe,

1. As to the first Proposition, ’Tis true indeed, that all the Children of *Adam*, are by Nature so enslaved to the Body, and the Lusts and Affections of it; to the Things of Sense and of this World, where-

by

by
no
Ch
Jo
Bu
is
the
I w
or l
not
Nu
Rea
Pre
and
is fi
Dis
are
and
ced
the
gran
Imp
any
The
tain
Insti
and
all
super
the
me
coul
super
their
do f
penf
all t
Apo
and
the S
Aid
pern
they

by Satan holds them in Subjection to his Empire ; that they cannot *raise* themselves to any Freedom to supernatural Good, till Christ, by the Power and Grace of his *Spirit*, sets them free. (See *Job*. viii. 34, 36. *Rom*. vi. 17, 22. and viii. 2. *Tit*. iii. 3. &c.) But that this Grace of the Redeemer is bestowed on *all Mankind*, is a manifest Error. Let this Writer explain what he means by the *supernatural Assistance of the Spirit, bestowed on all Mankind*; and I will undertake to prove, either that it can intend nothing more or less than the *Quakers* Doctrine of the *Light within* ; or that it is not common to all Mankind, but restrained to a much smaller Number. God has left with Man fallen the natural Gifts of Reason and Conscience, capable of some Sense of a Deity, and some Prefages of a World to come, and of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, influencing his Hopes and Fears ; whereby he is fitted for a State of Trial in this World, whereunto also the Dispensations of external Providence in Mercies and Judgments are suited. Yet all these go not beyond the Sphere of the Light and Law of *Nature*. Nevertheless, by these Means Men are induced to the Practice of many Duties of *Morality* ; such as conduce to the Preservation of Order, and the Benefit of Society. So it is granted, that Men still have Liberty for *much moral Good*, in the Improvement of their natural Capacities, without Revelation, or any supernatural Dispensation. The Apostle saith, *Rom*. ii. 14. *The Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by Nature the Things contained in the Law.* — By *Nature*, i. e. by the sole Guidance and Instinct of Nature, or by the Light and Dictates of natural Reason and Conscience ; and this is the only Gift or Aid bestowed on *all Mankind*, to make them free to some *moral Good* : but this is not *supernatural*. As to *supernatural Good*, respecting a Compliance with the Conditions of *Salvation*, Repentance and Faith in Christ, the meer Power of *Nature* is not sufficient. No Man ever did, or could do *by Nature*, the Things contained in the *Gospel* : but the supernatural Grace of the Spirit is requisite to deliver Sinners from their spiritual Bondage, and raise them to a true Freedom to do such Good. But this *supernatural Grace* is far from being dispensed to *all Mankind* ; so far, that it is not dispensed even to all the Few that enjoy the Gospel-Revelation. Why else does the Apostle distinguish all Mankind into such as are *after the Flesh*, and such as are *after the Spirit* ? *Rom*. viii. 5. Are all Men *after the Spirit* ? or, Is not this implied in their having the supernatural Aid of the Spirit imparted to them ? — If it be said, All have this supernatural Grace and Assistance of the Spirit *offered* to them, but they do not *improve* it : This, especially as to Mankind in general,

is

is *Gratis dictum*, said without Proof; and is contradicted by the Apostle in the following Context, Verse 8. *So then they that are in the Flesh, cannot please God.* Surely, if they had the supernatural Aid of the Spirit giving them a free Power, or ready for their Assistance, they might, and could *please God*; but the Apostle tells us *they cannot*, they are under an Incapacity, till by the Regeneration of the Spirit, they are, of *carnal*, made *spiritual*. (*Job. iii. 5, 6.*)—I might multiply Testimonies of Sacred Writ to this Purpose; which plainly shew, that all Mankind are not made *free* from their natural Servitude under Sin, and *free* to spiritual Good, by any supernatural Grace supposed to be bestowed on them. Let one or two suffice. In *Job. i. 12, 13.* there was a distinguished Number of the *Jews* (though but very few) that believed in Christ, when the Body of that People rejected him. *But as many as received him, to them gave he Power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his Name.* The Reason of this Distinction is in the following Words; Verse 13. *Which were born, not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Flesh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.* Here the free Will of Man is set aside, and the Power and Grace of God is assigned as the sole Cause of Regeneration and Faith in Christ. To say, that all Men have supernatural Grace, either conferred on them or offered to them, to make them *free to do Good* (spiritual Good, I mean, in Compliance with the Terms of *Salvation*) but that they will not *improve* it, and so have no Experience of the *Effect* of that Grace in themselves, (which is to set the Will free from its carnal Bias) is but to confess, that they still *remain* under that Loss of their *Freedom* to do Good, and that *Slavery* to the Body and its Lusts, in which the Fall of *Adam* left them. And so this universal supernatural Grace or Aid, bestowed for the Purpose mentioned, appears to be an *insignificant* Conceit.

This will be yet more evident from the next Passage I shall cite; which is *Job. vi. 44.* *No Man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him.* Here *all free Power in Man* to comply with the Terms of *Salvation*, is denied, without the *drawing of the Father*. If it be said, that the supernatural Grace, bestowed on fallen Man, *removes* this Impotency, and gives him a free Power, that if he *would*, he *might* and *could* come to Christ: I answer, Then he *certainly would* come to Christ; for the Father's *Drawing*, which is made necessary to a Sinner's Conversion, is *always effectual*. Hence it follows, *Verse 45.* *Every Man therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Supernatural Grace, in the *Teaching and Drawing of the Father*, invincibly carries its Effect; so that the Sinner thus *taught and drawn,*

drawn, infallibly (yet freely) *comes to* Christ. But this can by no Means be said of any supernatural Assistance afforded to *All*. There is (I grant) that which is called the *common Grace* of the Spirit, imparted to Men by Gospel-Light and Conviction; with some lower ineffectual Motions and Operations upon their Heart (leaving them still enslaved to their *Lusts*) which may be called *supernatural*: Yet this is not common to *all* the World, but to those who enjoy the supernatural Revelation of the *Gospel*, which is the *Ministration of the Spirit*. But now,

2. As to the other Proposition, *viz.* That *this supernatural Grace, or Assistance of the Spirit, is bestowed on all Mankind, to raise them to that Freedom of Choice, in which Adam was placed, (before the Fall, he means; otherwise he says Nothing to the Purpose) all I shall say, is, This is not only affirmed without Proof, but is contrary to Scripture, Reason, and Experience; and is so far from being true of all Mankind, that it cannot be said of any one good or holy Man upon Earth. Surely Adam was not created by God, at first, in such a State of Frailty, with Respect to his Freedom to choose or do Good, as the best of Men find in themselves in this mortal Life. The Scripture assures us, that God created Man in his own Image (Gen. i. 27.) and that God hath made Man upright (Eccl. vii. 29.) i. e. perfect, in Soul and Body; endowed with all the Perfections of reasonable Nature, fitting and enabling him to answer the End of his Creation, in glorifying God (as Reason dictates, the first Man, who was the immediate Workmanship of the Creator, must be made) and among these, that which is of chief Consideration, is the moral Rectitude of his Faculties, wherein he resembled his Maker, in Wisdom and Knowledge, Holiness and Righteousness; and consequently was endowed with a perfect Freedom of Will, to obey the Law of God, and chuse that which is good; but still so, that he was liable to chuse the Contrary, being in his best State a mutable Creature, as the Event has manifested; yet was his Will free from the least inward Bias, or corrupt Motion of the Affections; there being in that State of moral Purity no garring of the inferior Faculties and Passions with the Law of the Mind, such as are found in our degenerate Nature, not wholly cured by Grace. In such a perfect State of Mind and Will, both Reason and Scripture lead us to conceive the first Man placed. To suppose the Contrary, that Man was made at first so morally frail and imperfect a Creature, subject to such corrupt Biasses, as Men generally are in this present State, and from which the holiest are not intirely free, is derogatory and reproachful to the Wisdom, Holiness, and Goodness of the glorious Creator. Was there*

there ever any meer Man, since the Fall, raised, by any Gift or Aid of Grace, natural or supernatural, to that Freedom of Will to chuse or to do Good, in which Adam was placed originally? Or, Was this first Man, as he came out of his Creator's Hands, of such a Constitution and Frame, as might minister the least Occasion for any Complaints like those of holy Paul? (Rom. vii. 21, 23, 24.) *I find a Law, that when I would do Good, Evil is present with me. — I see another Law in my Members, warring against the Law of my Mind. — O wretched Man that I am! — (Abſit Blaſphemia!) —* It avails Nothing, to ſay, The Apoſtle ſpeaks here in the Name or Perſon of an unregenerate Man, under the Law: For the ſame doctrinal Truth, here ſuppoſed, is confirmed by other plain Texts. *ex. gr. Gal. v. 17. The Fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit, and the Spirit againſt the Fleſh: And theſe are contrary the one to the other; ſo that ye cannot do the Things that ye would.* Whence it is evident, that even the Regenerate in this Life (much more the Reſt of Mankind) are far from that perfect Freedom to do Good, which Adam ſtood poſſeſſed of in Innocency. This is not the Attainment of the greateſt Proficients in Grace and Holineſs on Earth; nor to be expected till they put off Mortality, and Grace is perfected in Glory.

But before I conclude, there is one Paſſage more in this Writer, which I muſt not forget to take ſome Notice of. (It occurs towards the Beginning of his Supplement, but I have reſerved the Conſideration of it to the laſt.) “It is a popular Argument” (ſays he) “among thoſe who call themſelves Calviniſts, in Favour of the “Doctrin of Original Sin, That a Man needs no other Proof of “the Truth of it, than a careful Attention to the Motions of his “own Heart and Inclinations, which he will find continually “tempting him to Evil.” — This Argument he propoſes to ſhew, is inconcluſive; and that by the Effect, which “the Sin of Adam “had upon his Poſterity,” as he has ſtated it. — There are two Things to be diſtinctly conſidered in Original Sin. One is, the Corruption and vitious Inclination of our Nature: The other, the Original of this Corruption, or its Derivation from the Sin of Adam. This latter, we confeſs, is a Matter of Faith; being made known to us only in the Holy Scriptures. The former is a Matter of Senſe and Experience; yet not ſo fully manifested, as when the Light of Scripture is brought to our Hearts. As Paul ſaith, *I had not known Sin* (Original Sin, or the Sin of Nature) *but by the Law; for I had not known Luſt, &c. Rom. vii. 7.* Now though we do not ſay, that we need no other Proof of the Derivation of a corrupt Nature from Adam, than a careful Attention to the Motions and evil Inclinations of our own Hearts; for the Scrip-
ture

nure must help us out here : Yet every one who hath his spiritual *Senses exercised to discern both Good and Evil*, may, by an intimate Inspection into his own Heart, its Propensities to that which is evil, its Aversion to what is holy and good, the Disorder of the Passions, the Rebellion of Lust (or the carnal Principle) against Reason and Grace, find the Evidences of a corrupted dis-tempered *Nature*, sufficient for his Conviction, so that he should need *no other Proof* of this. And they that have the Scriptures, and believe them, will need no other Proof of the *Original* of this Disorder of Nature. — But why does this Writer attempt to shew the Inconclusiveness of this Evidence, by the *Effect* of *Adam's Sin* on his Posterity, as he has stated it, *viz. A disordered Body, influencing the Affections of the Soul, to disorderly, that is, evil Actions*, which is, near upon the Matter, the *same Thing* with what we call *Original Sin*, as to the *positive Part* of it ? So that, by his own Account, every Time we find our Souls influenced to evil Actions, by bodily Passions, Imaginations and Lusts, we have sensible Proof of what he calls *Original Sin*, or *Corruption* : Only he will not own it to be *properly Sin* ; whose Mistake herein I have already shewed. But I observe, he expresses this Argument of the *Calvinists* very superficially, and defectively ; mentioning only, a Man's *finding his Heart continually tempting him to Evil*. Whereas, we don't place the chief Evidence of natural Corruption in the Prone-ness we find in our Hearts to Sin, (this, with Respect to some Vices, may be the Effect of *Custom*) but in the Effects of the *privative Part* of Original Sin ; in the *Loss* of the Image of God, to which we are in Part, and but in Part, renewed by Grace ; in our Defection from original Righteousness ; in the Aversion of the Soul from God (which is the universal Malady of the Souls of Men by *Nature*) in not favouring the Things of God, but the Things of the Flesh (till Regeneration fixes a new and holy Bias on the Heart) in not loving God (in whom there is every Excellency, attractive of a rational Esteem and Love) above this World ; in caring for the Body, more than for the Soul, and its spiritual Felicity, resulting from the Image and Favour of God ; in our Unbelief, Distrust of God, and affecting an Independency on him ; trusting in ourselves and Creatures ; departing from the Living God ; the Backwardness of our Hearts to all holy Converse and Communion with God ; and our Unlikeness to him in his moral Perfections, &c. The Experience of *these Things*, in rational Beings, are plain Evidences of an *Apostacy from God* : And he must be a Stranger to God, and his own Heart, who has no *sensible Experience* of these Effects (among others that might be mentioned)

of

of Man's Apostacy; the *Remains* whereof in Holy Souls are Matter of their greatest Grief and Lamentation. And since we all find, or may find (by serious Communing with our own Hearts) more or less of these deplorable *Effects*, we may no more doubt of the *Thing itself*, that our *Nature* is corrupted, and has lost its primitive Integrity.—And though there are Difficulties attending the Explication of the Manner of *conveying* this natural Corruption to us, yet it is certainly safest, and best, and most agreeable to the Spirit of Christian Piety, to govern our Sentiments therein by the plain Scripture-Revelation, and to assign its Origin to the Sin and Fall of *Adam*, without affecting to be wise above what is written. Therefore, in *Ste*ad of advancing Schemes diverse from, and independent on, or opposite to the Sacred Oracles, for solving all Difficulties relating to this Doctrine, we should acquiesce in this plain Scripture-Account of the Matter, that *By one Man Sin entered into the World*—And, *By one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners*—And, *By the Offence of One, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation*. And let us join in bewailing the Apostacy of human Nature in the Fountain and Origin of it, and the sad *Effects* of it, which we find in our Souls and Bodies. And let us join in *admiring* and *magnifying* the transcendent *Grace* of God, in appointing his own incarnate Son to be a *Second Adam*, another *Head* of Men, by whom there is a full Remedy brought in against the ill *Effects* of the first *Adam's* Apostacy; that *receiving* him by Faith, and the *Abundance of Grace* he brings with him and offers to us, we might obtain *Justification of Life*, through his meritorious *Righteousness* and *Obedience*; in whom we shall find all our Losses in and by our first Father, *Adam*, abundantly repaired, and made up, to our infinite Advantage, in that *Eternal Life*, which is the *Gift of GOD*, through *JESUS CHRIST* our Lord. To whom be Glory for ever. *Amen.*



E I N I S.

